

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. 813-07/LM-20/2019-DS-II**Dated:29-12-2022****To**

All Internet Service Licensee's

Subject: C.S.(COMM) No. 366 of 2019; Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. vs <https://hindilinks4u.to> & Ors., before Hon'ble Delhi High Court.

In continuation to Department of Telecommunications even no. letters dated 13.08.2019, 15.01.2020 & 08.10.2021; kindly find the enclosed herewith a copy of the Hon'ble Delhi High court order dated 14th December 2022 read with orders dated 08th September 2022 & 24th July 2019 in respect of websites of **Defendant no. 53 to 55** in the subject matter court case C.S.(Comm) No. 366 of 2019 for compliance.

2. Hon'ble Court in order dated 14th December 2022 has, inter alia, stated that:

I.A. 21276/2022 filed by plaintiff Under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of additional mirrors, redirects or alpha numeric variations as defendants 53-55 in the memo of parties.

.....In view of the submissions and judgment relied upon by learned counsel for applicant, the websites mentioned in the prayer clause of the application especially Schedule-A are impleaded as defendant no. 53-55.

*Since the newly added defendants are also stated to be involved in violation of copyrights of plaintiff, accordingly ex-parte ad-interim injunction dated 24.07.2019 is also extended against newly added defendant no.53-55. **The DoT, ISP and MEITY are directed to do the needful in terms of the abovesaid ex-parte ad-interim injunction dated 24.07.2019.***

3. In view of the above, all the Internet Service licensees are requested to take immediate necessary blocking action for compliance of the Hon'ble court order dated 14th December 2022 read with orders dated 08th September 2022 & 24th July 2019 in respect of websites of **Defendant no. 53 to 55** as mentioned in amended memo of parties/Schedule-A (copy enclosed).

Director (DS-II)
email: dirds2-dot@nic.in

Encl: A/A

Copy to:

- i. Sh. V. Chinnasamy, Scientist E (chinnasamy.v@meity.gov.in), Electronics Niketan, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) New Delhi (Respondent no. 12) for kind information and necessary action.
- ii. Lawyer/Advocate for the Plaintiffs for kind information.
- iii. DoT Website.

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(COMM) 366/2019
WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC.

..... Plaintiff

Through: Ms.R.Ramya, Ms.Mehr
Sidhu, Advocates

versus

HTTPS:HINDILINKS4U.TO & ORS.

..... Defendant

Through: None

CORAM:
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) SH. PURSHOTAM
PATHAK (DHJS)

ORDER
14.12.2022

%

I.A. 21276/2022 filed by plaintiff Under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment of additional mirrors, redirects or alpha numeric variations as defendants 53-55 in the memo of parties.

Vide this order, I shall dispose of the present application filed by plaintiff under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for impleadment. The learned counsel for plaintiff has submitted that the Hon'ble Court was pleased to grant ex-parte *ad-interim* injunction in this suit against the defendants vide order dated 24.07.2019 for infringement of copyrights with further directions that as and when plaintiff files an application under Order 1 Rule 10 for impleadment of such websites, plaintiff shall file an affidavit confirming that the newly impleaded websites are mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites, with sufficient supporting evidence and that the application shall be listed before Joint Registrar, who on being satisfied with the material placed on record, shall issue directions to the ISPs to disable access in India

in such mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites.

It is stated that after passing of the abovesaid judgment, other websites, as disclosed in application, have also started violation and these are mirrors, redirects or alphanumeric variations of the website blocked pursuant to the order dated 24.07.2019 and are also necessary party to this suit. It is further stated that details of proposed defendants has been disclosed in Schedule-A annexed with application and they are also liable to be impleaded as defendant no.53-55. It is further argued that even interim order dated 24.07.2019 is also liable to be extended against them and application may be allowed.

I have heard the arguments and perused the record. The law to deal with such applications and extension of *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction to newly added defendant has already been laid down in *UTV Software Communication Ltd. & Ors. vs. 1337X.TO & Ors.*, wherein it has been observed vide paragraph 107 to the effect:-

“107. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings, a decree of permanent injunction is passed restraining the defendant-websites (as mentioned in the chart in paragraph no. 4(i) of this judgment) their owners, partners, proprietors, officers, 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, 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 websites, through the internet in any manner whatsoever, any cinematograph work/content/programme/show in relation to which plaintiffs have copyright. A decree is also passed directing the ISPs to block access to the said defendant-websites. DoT and MEITY are directed to issue a notification calling upon the various internet and telecom service

providers registered under it to block access to the said defendant-websites. The plaintiffs are permitted to implead the mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites under Order I Rule 10 CPC in the event they merely provide new means of accessing the same primary infringing websites that have been enjoined. The plaintiffs are also held entitled to actual costs of litigation. The costs shall amongst others include the lawyer's fees as well as the amount spent on Court-fees. The plaintiffs are given liberty to file on record the exact cost incurred by them in adjudication of the present suits. Registry is directed to prepare decree sheets accordingly.”

The plaintiff has filed affidavit of investigator along with sufficient material to prove that proposed defendants/websites are mirror/redirect/ alphanumeric websites of defendants which are also involved in violation of copyrights of plaintiff and have been permanently restrained to do so. In view of the submissions and judgment relied upon by learned counsel for applicant, the websites mentioned in the prayer clause of the application especially Schedule-A are impleaded as defendant no. 53-55.

Since the newly added defendants are also stated to be involved in violation of copyrights of plaintiff, accordingly *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction dated 24.07.2019 is also extended against newly added defendant no.53-55. The DoT, ISP and MEITY are directed to do the needful in terms of the abovesaid *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction dated 24.07.2019.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

Let defendant no.53-55 be summoned on filing of PF and through all permissible modes including e-mail, returnable by the date already fixed.

I.A. stands disposed of.

Registry is directed to do the needful.

Copy of order be given *dasti*.

**PURSHOTAM PATHAK (DHJS),
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)**

DECEMBER 14, 2022/sk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any



* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Reserved on: 26.08.2022

Date of decision: 08.09.2022

+ CS (COMM) 366/2019 & I.A 9850/2019, I.A. 9852/2019 & I.A. 10892/2022

WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC Plaintiff

Through: Ms.Suhasini Raina, Ms.R.Ramya
and Ms.Mehr Sidhu, Advs.

Versus

HTTPS:HINDILINKS4U.TO & ORS. Defendants

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

1. The Plaintiff has filed the present suit *inter-alia* praying for the following reliefs:

“51. In light of the foregoing, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to:

i. Issue an order and decree of permanent injunction restraining the Defendant No. 1 (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Website, and other domains/domain owners/website operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive rights), its owners, partners, proprietors, officers, 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, 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



websites, through the internet in any manner whatsoever, any cinematograph work/content/programme/ show in relation to which Plaintiff has copyright,

ii. Issue an order and decree directing the Defendant Nos. 2-10, 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 Defendant No. 1 website identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Website, and other domains/domain owners/website operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive rights)

iii. Issue an order directing the Defendant Nos. 11 and 12, to issue a notification calling upon the various internet and telecom service providers registered under it to block access to the Defendant No. 1 websites identified by the Plaintiff in the instant suit (and such other mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites discovered to provide additional means of accessing the Defendant Website, and other domains/domain owners/website operators/entities which are discovered to have been engaging in infringing the Plaintiff's exclusive rights);

iv. Issue an order directing the Domain Name Registrars of the Defendant Website identified by the Plaintiff in the Plaintiff to disclose the contact details and other details about the owner of the said websites, and other such relief as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper;”

2. The Plaintiff claims itself to be a global entertainment company under the laws of the State of Delaware, the United States of America, and as being engaged in the business of creation, production, and distribution of motion pictures. The Plaintiff has also received certain



reputed awards, such as the Academy Award for “Best Motion Picture” for “Argo” in 2012.

3. It is the contention of the Plaintiff that the motion pictures produced by the Plaintiff, being works of visual recording and which include sound recordings accompanying such visual recordings, qualify to be a ‘*cinematograph film*’ under Section 2(f) of the Copyright Act, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”). The Plaintiff claims that this Court has jurisdiction by virtue of Section 13(1) read with Sections 13(2) and 5 of the Act, since the Plaintiff’s cinematograph films are released in India, the cinematograph films of the Plaintiff would be entitled to all the rights and protections granted under the provisions of the Act.

4. The claim of the Plaintiff is premised on the allegation of illegal and unauthorized distribution, broadcasting, re-broadcasting, transmission and streaming of the Plaintiff’s original content by the Defendant Nos. 1, 51 and 52 (hereinafter referred to as the “rogue websites”). It is the case of the Plaintiff that as a result of the unauthorized transmission of their content, the rogue websites infringe the copyright of the Plaintiff in the original works produced by it, which have been granted protection under the provisions of the Act.

5. The Plaintiff has impleaded various Internet Service Providers (in short, “ISPs”) as the Defendant Nos. 2-10 and the concerned departments of the Government of India as the Defendant nos. 11 and 12. The ISPs and the concerned departments have been impleaded for the limited relief of making compliance with any directions of this Court granted in favor of the Plaintiff.



6. The Plaintiff has alleged that the defendant nos. 1, 51 and 52 are the rogue websites. The Plaintiff, vide an investigation conducted by an independent investigator, learnt of the extent of the infringing activity of the rogue websites, in as much as the rogue websites have infringed the Plaintiff's copyright under the provisions of the Act in the original content by unauthorized distribution, broadcasting, re-broadcasting, transmission and streaming and/or by facilitating the use of the rogue websites, *inter alia* by downloading and streaming the Plaintiff's original cinematograph films in which copyright vests.

7. It is also the case of the Plaintiff that a cease-and-desist notice was served on the rogue websites calling upon them to cease from engaging in their infringing activities. Despite the legal notice, the rogue websites continue to infringe the rights of the Plaintiff in its original content.

8. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff presses only for prayers (i), (ii) and (iii), as noted hereinabove, of the plaint. The other reliefs as made in the plaint are not pressed.

9. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff relies upon the judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in a batch of petitions dated 10.04.2019, including *UTV Software Communication Ltd. & Ors. v. 1337X.to & Ors.*, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8002, which deal with the determination of rogue websites.

10. The Plaintiff thereafter filed I.A. 10892 of 2022 under Order XIII A read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, as applicable to commercial disputes (hereinafter referred to as "CPC"), seeking a summary judgment. The said application was listed before this Court on 18.07.2022, wherein this Court recorded that the service and pleadings



are complete in regard to all the Defendants and that the rogue websites have neither appeared nor have filed written statements in the present suit till date. Further, this Court directed the suit to proceed *ex-parte* qua defendant nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13 to 50, 51 and 52 (which includes the rogue websites).

11. The grounds for filing the present application, as enumerated by the Plaintiff in the same, are as follows:

a. That all the Defendants have been duly served by the Plaintiff, however, only the Defendant Nos. 2, 7, 9, 11 and 12 have entered appearance before this Hon'ble Court.

b. That the Defendant Nos. 1, 51 and 52, being the rogue websites, against whom the Plaintiff is seeking primary relief, are illegally streaming the Plaintiff's content on their websites and even after being duly served by the Plaintiff, have decided not to contest the present suit.

c. That the Defendants have no real prospect of successfully defending the claim of copyright infringement under Section 51 of the Act and have further not chosen to contest the said claim.

d. Additionally, there is no other compelling reason as to why the present suit should not be disposed of before recording of oral evidence particularly in view of the fact that there is no dispute regarding the illegal activities of the Defendant Nos. 1, 51 and 52 and in any event, in the absence of any challenge or opposition to the factual allegations made in the plaint, in view of provisions of Order VIII Rule 5 of the CPC, there is no occasion for recording



of oral evidence in the present matter.

12. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff has relied upon Clause 3 of Chapter XA of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 which states the grounds under which a Court can pass a summary judgment.

13. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff has drawn my attention to two affidavits filed by Mr. Manish Vaishampayan, who conducted the investigation with regard to the aforesaid websites on the instance of the Plaintiff, to contend that the said websites need to be treated as rogue websites. With respect to this contention, reliance is placed on the following documentary evidence in support of each of the aforesaid websites:

S.No.	Particulars	Court File Pagation along with Volume No.
1.	Print of Contact Details of various websites as available on WHOIS (primary domains):	
	1) hindilinks4u.to (Defendant 1)	Pg. 271-272 Folder IV (Vol. 2)
	2)Hindilinks4u.world (Defendant No. 51)	I.A No. 18418/2019 Pg. No. 55-58
	3) Hindilinks4u.pro (Defendant No.52)	I.A No. 12530/2019 Pg. No. 85-87
2.	Copies of proof of ownership of movie titles	



	a) Aquaman (Warner)	Pg. 26-27 Folder IV (Vol 1)
3.	Screenshots of Homepage of various websites (primary domains):	
	1)hindilinks4u.to (Defendant No. 1)	Pg. 232-236 Folder IV (Vol. 2)
	2)Hindilinks4u.world (Defendant No. 51)	I.A No. 18418/2019 Pg. 34-37
	3)Hindilinks4u.pro (Defendant No.52)	I.A No. 12530/2021 Pg. 35-40
4.	Printout of proof of infringement by websites (primary domains):	
	1)hindilinks4u.to (Defendant No. 1)	Pg. 251-270 Folder IV (Vol. 2)
5.	Printouts of the DMCA, FAQ, etc. pages, evidencing infringing nature of the Defendant Websites:	
	1)hindilinks4u.to (Defendant No. 1) DMCA	Pg. 237 – 239 Folder IV (Vol.2)
	2)hindilinks4u.to (Defendant No. 1) Contact us	Pg.240-242 Folder IV (Vol.2)



14. I have heard the learned counsel for the Plaintiff.

15. In *UTV Software (supra)*, a Coordinate Bench of this Court, as far as the rogue websites are concerned, identified the following illustrative factors to be considered in determining whether a particular website falls within that class:

“59. In the opinion of this Court, some of the factors to be considered for determining whether the website complained of is a FIOL/Rogue Website are:-

- a. whether the primary purpose of the website is to commit or facilitate copyright infringement;*
- b. the flagrancy of the infringement, or the flagrancy of the facilitation of the infringement;*
- c. Whether the detail of the registrant is masked and no personal or traceable detail is available either of the Registrant or of the user.*
- d. Whether there is silence or inaction by such website after receipt of take down notices pertaining to copyright infringement.*
- e. Whether the online location makes available or contains directories, indexes or categories of the means to infringe, or facilitate an infringement of, copyright;*
- f. Whether the owner or operator of the online location demonstrates a disregard for copyright generally;*
- g. Whether access to the online location has been disabled by orders from any court of another country or territory on the ground of or related to copyright infringement;*
- h. whether the website contains guides or instructions to circumvent measures, or any order of any court, that disables access to the website on the ground of or related to copyright infringement; and*
- i. the volume of traffic at or frequency of access to the website;*
- j. Any other relevant matter.*

60. This Court clarifies that the aforementioned factors are illustrative and not exhaustive and do



not apply to intermediaries as they are governed by IT Act, having statutory immunity and function in a wholly different manner.

xxxxx

69. Consequently, the real test for examining whether a website is a Rogue Website is a qualitative approach and not a quantitative one.”

16. This Court, in ***UTV Software*** (*supra*) further held as under:

“29. It is important to realise that piracy reduces jobs, exports and overall competitiveness in addition to standards of living for a nation and its citizens. More directly, online piracy harms the artists and creators, both the struggling as well as the rich and famous, who create content, as well as the technicians-sound engineers, editors, set designers, software and game designers-who produce it and those who support its marketing, distribution and end sales. Consequently, online piracy has had a very real and tangible impact on the film industry and rights of the owners.

30. The Indian Copyright Act, 1957 (“the Copyright Act”) confers a bundle of exclusive rights on the owner of a “work” and provides for remedies in case the copyright is infringed.

xxxxx

34. The above definitions make it clear that making any work available for being seen or heard by the public whether simultaneously or at places chosen individually, regardless of whether the public actually sees the film, will constitute communication of the film to the public. The intent was to include digital copies of works, which would include within its scope digital copies of works being made available online (as opposed to the physical world). Communication can be by various means such as directly or by display or diffusion. In this context, definition of “broadcast” is also relevant which identifies communication to public by wireless diffusion or by wire. Thus, making available of a film for streaming or downloads in the form of digital



copies on the internet is within the scope of “communication to the public”.

35. It is pertinent to note that the definition of “communication to the public” was first added in the Copyright Act by the 1983 Amendment and was as follows:-

“Communication to the public” means communication to the public in whatever manner, including communication through satellite”.

xxxxx

53. Also should an infringer of the copyright on the Internet be treated differently from an infringer in the physical world? If the view of the aforesaid Internet exceptionalists school of thought is accepted, then all infringers would shift to the e-world and claim immunity!

54. A world without law is a lawless world. In fact, this Court is of the view that there is no logical reason why a crime in the physical world is not a crime in the digital world especially when the Copyright Act does not make any such distinction.

xxxxx

80. In the opinion of this Court, while blocking is antithetical to efforts to preserve a “free and open” Internet, it does not mean that every website should be freely accessible. Even the most vocal supporters of Internet freedom recognize that it is legitimate to remove or limit access to some materials online, such as sites that facilitate child pornography and terrorism. Undoubtedly, there is a serious concern associated with blocking orders that it may prevent access to legitimate content. There is need for a balance in approach and policies to avoid unnecessary cost or impact on other interests and rights. Consequently, the onus is on the right holders to prove to the satisfaction of the Court that each website they want to block is primarily facilitating wide spread copyright infringement.

xxxxxx

82. One can easily see the appeal in passing a URL blocking order, which adequately addresses over-blocking. A URL specific order need not affect the remainder of the website. However,



right-holders claim that approaching the Court or the ISPs again and again is cumbersome, particularly in the case of websites promoting rampant piracy.

83. *This Court is of the view that to ask the plaintiffs to identify individual infringing URLs would not be proportionate or practicable as it would require the plaintiffs to expend considerable effort and cost in notifying long lists of URLs to ISPs on a daily basis. The position might have been different if defendants' websites had a substantial proportion of non-infringing content, but that is not the case.*

84. *This Court is of the view that while passing a website blocking injunction order, it would have to also consider whether disabling access to the online location is in the public interest and a proportionate response in the circumstances and the impact on any person or class of persons likely to be affected by the grant of injunction. The Court order must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive, but must not create barriers to legitimate trade. The measures must also be fair and not excessively costly (See: *Loreal v. Ebay*, [Case C 324/09]).*

xxxxxx

86. *Consequently, website blocking in the case of rogue websites, like the defendant-websites, strikes a balance between preserving the benefits of a free and open Internet and efforts to stop crimes such as digital piracy.*

87. *This Court is also of the opinion that it has the power to order ISPs and the DoT as well as MEITY to take measures to stop current infringements as well as if justified by the circumstances prevent future ones."*

17. It is notable that the Plaintiff had filed similar application under Order XIII A of the CPC (as applicable to commercial disputes) in similar suit, being ***Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. Vs. <https://Otorrents.Com> & Ors.*** (CS (COMM) 367 of 2019), ***Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. Vs. <https://www2.Filmlinks4u.is> & Ors.*** (CS (COMM). 368 of 2019),



Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. Vs. <http://Mp4moviez.io> & Ors. (CS (COMM) 399 of 2019) and **Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. vs. <https://WWW.TAMILROCKERMovies.COM> & Ors.** (CS (COMM). 419 of 2019), wherein this Court, relying on the judgement, **UTV Software Communication Ltd.** (*supra*) has decreed the suits in favor of the plaintiff.

18. In the present case, vide order dated 24.07.2019, this Court had granted an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction against the Defendant No. 1, their owners, partners, proprietors, officers, 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, thereby restraining them from, hosting, streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and/or communicating to the public, or facilitating the same, in any manner, on their websites, through the internet any cinematograph work/content/programme/ show in relation to which the Plaintiff has copyright.

19. Vide the same order, this Court had directed the Defendant Nos. 2 to 10 to block the domain name 'hindilinks4u.to' and its URL <https://hindilinks4u.to> with the IP address 104.27.162.170 and 104.27.163.170. This Court further directed the Defendant Nos. 11 and 12 to suspend the above-mentioned domain name registration of the Defendant No. 1 and issue requisite notifications calling upon various internet and telecom service providers registered under them to block the aforementioned website identified by the Plaintiff.

20. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff submits that pursuant to the *ex-parte ad interim* order dated 24.07.2019, the Defendant No. 11 has



issued a notification in compliance. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff further states that the Defendant Nos. 2 to 10 have blocked the rogue websites, that is, Defendant No. 1's websites.

21. Also, vide the same order, this Court also observed the following:

“21. Further, as held by this court in UTV Software Communication Ltd. (supra), in order for this court to be freed from constant monitoring and adjudicating the issues of mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites it is directed that as and when Plaintiff files an application under Order I Rule 10 for impleadment of such websites, Plaintiff shall file an affidavit confirming that the newly impleaded website is mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website with sufficient supporting evidence. Such application shall be listed before the Joint Registrar, who on being satisfied with the material placed on record, shall issue directions to the ISPs to disable access in India to such mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites”.

22. In light of the aforesaid direction, the Plaintiff filed applications under Order I Rule 10 of CPC for the impleadment of the Defendant No. 51 and 52 in the present suit proceedings, being I.A. No. 18418/2019 and I.A. No. 12530/2021 respectively, which were allowed by this Court vide orders dated 24.12.2019 and 29.09.2021 respectively, and the *ex-parte ad-interim* order dated 24.07.2019 was thereby extended to the Defendant No. 51 and 52.

23. Thereafter, on 06.09.2021, the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial), passed the following order in regard to Defendant No. 51:-

“No written statement filed by defendant no.51 despite service. Consequent to it, no replication filed.



All of the contesting defendants against whom substantial relief has been sought by the plaintiff have been served, however they have not preferred to appear to contest this case or to file a written statement and affidavit of admission/denial of documents.

Other defendants who were supposed to comply with interim directions have already complied with.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff has submitted that there is no document for admission/denial of documents.”

In the interest of justice, no adverse order passed, put up for further proceedings on 25.10.2021.”

24. On 09.05.2022, the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) passed the following order in regards to Defendant No. 52:-

“No written statement filed by newly impleaded defendant no.52 despite service.

All of the contesting defendants against whom substantial relief has been sought by' the plaintiff have been served, however they have not preferred to appear to contest this case or to file written statement and affidavit of admission/denial of documents. In this regard law shall take its own course.

Learned counsel for plaintiff submits that there is no document for admission/denial of documents. Hence, pleadings stand complete.

Other defendants who were supposed to comply with interim directions have already complied with.

At joint request, let the matter be placed before the Hon'ble Court for further directions on 18.07.2022.”

25. Since the Defendant Nos. 1, 51 and 52 are not appearing despite notice, and have been proceeded *ex-parte*, in my opinion, the suit can be



heard and decided summarily. The Defendant Nos. 1, 51 and 52 have no real prospect of successfully defending the claim of copyright infringement and have further not chosen to contest the said claim. The present matter is mainly concerned with the enforcement of the injunction orders which are passed against the rogue websites who do not have any defense to the claim of copyright infringement but use the anonymity offered by the internet to engage in illegal activities, such as copyright infringement in the present case.

26. On the basis of the evidence placed on record and keeping in mind the factors identified by this Court in *UTV Software (supra)*, I find that there is sufficient evidence to hold that the Defendant no. 1, 51 and 52 are “rogue websites” and that this is a fit case for passing a Summary Judgment invoking the provisions of Order XIII A of the CPC, as applicable to the commercial disputes.

27. In *UTV Software (supra)*, the Court also examined the issue of grant of dynamic injunctions and permitted subsequent impleadment of mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites which provide access to the rogue websites, by filing an application under Order I Rule 10 of the CPC before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) alongwith an affidavit with supporting evidence, confirming that the proposed website is mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website of the injuncted defendant websites. At the request of the counsel for the Plaintiff, the same directions are liable to be made in this case also.

28. Accordingly, I.A. No. 10892 of 2022 under Order XIII A of the CPC, as applicable to commercial disputes, seeking a summary judgment is allowed. All the pending applications are also disposed of.



29. The suit is, therefore, decreed in terms of prayers (i), (ii) and (iii) of the Plaint. The Plaintiff is also permitted to implead any mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites which provide access to the Defendants Nos. 1, 51 and 52's websites by filing an appropriate application under Order I Rule 10 of the CPC, supported by affidavits and evidence as directed in *UTV Software (supra)*. Any website impleaded as a result of such application will be subject to the same decree.

30. Let a decree sheet be drawn up accordingly.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J.

SEPTEMBER 8, 2022/ai

सत्यमेव जयते

Persals
of
Parsies

11

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

CS(COMM) NO. 366 OF 2019

IN THE MATTER OF

Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.

...Plaintiff

Versus

<https://hindilinks4u.to> & Ors.

...Defendants

MEMO OF PARTIES

Recht
Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi

Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.

4000 Warner Boulevard, Burbank,

California 91522, United States of America

Email: antipiracy@warnerbros.com

...Plaintiff

Versus

1) <https://hindilinks4u.to>

Email:

hindilinks4u.net@domainsbyproxy.com

f. zuly

Certified to be True Copy

P
Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi
Authorised Under
Section 29 of the Court Fees Act, 1973

- 2) Atria Convergence Technologies Pvt. Ltd.
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
nodal.term@actcorp.in
nodalofficer.ncr@actcorp.in

- 3) Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.
Bharat Sanchar Bhawan, Regulation Cell
5th floor, Harish Chandra Mathur Lane
Janpath, New Delhi -110001
ddg_reg@bsnl.co.in; sbkhare@bsnl.co.in

- 4) Bharti Airtel Ltd.
Airtel Centre, Tower-A, 6th floor

Certified to be True Copy
Examiner J. [Signature]
High Court of Karnataka
Authorised Under Section 27
Indian Evidence Act

[Handwritten Signature]

Brazler

Blairt

13

'A'Wing, Plot No.16, Udyog Vihar

Ph - IV, Gurgaon – 122016

ravi.gandhi@airtel.in;121@in.airtel.com;

compliance.officer@bharti.in

5) Hathway Cable & Datacom Pvt. Ltd.

'Rahejas',4 floor, Main Avenue

Santacruz (W), Mumbai-400054

ajay.singh@hathway.net;

dulal@hathway.net;

Sudhir.shetye@hathway.net

6) Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.

5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan

9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road

New Delhi – 110003

raco.mtnl@gmail.com;

mtnlcsc@gmail.com

7) Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited

RCP 14 (TC 23), Phase 4,

B-Block , 3rd Floor,

C 4 130 Twane- belapur Road,

Deputed to be True Copy

Examiner of Documents
High Court of Madhya Pradesh
Authorised Officer
Bhopal Evidence No. 2

V. K. Singh

Gansoli,
Navi Mumbai- 400701
care@jio.com


- 8) 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
info@spectra.co; compliance@spectra.co

- 9) Tata Teleservices Ltd.
A, E & F Blocks
Voltas Premises - T. B. Kadam Marg
Chinchpokli, Mumbai – 400033
pravin.jogani@tatatel.co.in

- 10) Vodafone India Limited

Certified to be True Copy


Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi at
Authorised Under Section 70
Indian Evidence Act



Prakash

Prakash

15

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
Appellate.mum@vodafone.com,
nodal.mum@vodafone.com

- 11) Department of Telecommunications
Through Secretary,
Ministry of Communications and IT,
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi – 110001
secy-dot@nic.in, dirids2-dot@nic.in,
- 12) Ministry of Electronics and Information
Technology

Certified to be True Copy

Examiner Judicial Commission
of section 10
Indian Evidence Act

Vandana

Boards

Plaint

Through the Director General (DIT) Cyber
Laws & e-security),

Electronics Niketan, 6, CGO Complex,
Lodi Road, New Delhi – 110003

cyberlaw@meity.gov.in ,
gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in,
pkumar@meity.gov.in,
sathya.s@meity.gov.in

(13-50) Ashok Kumars

... Defendants

[Signature]
D/2982/2011
SUHASINI RAINA

Place: New Delhi
Date: 22nd July, 2019

Saikrishna and Associates
Advocates for the Plaintiff
10 Jor bagh,
First Floor,
New Delhi, 110003
+91 9810621272
dilip@saikrishnaassociates.com

Note: Defendant No.1 is the main contesting party.

[Signature]
D/2733/17
(22/7/19)

Certified to be True Copy
[Signature]
Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi of
Authorised Under Section 10
Section 10

[Signature]

\$~31

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

+ **CS(COMM) 366/2019**

WARNER BROS. ENTERTAINMENT INC. Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sai Krishna Rajagopal,
Ms. Suhasini Raina, Ms. Disha
Sharma and Ms. Snehima Jauhari,
Advocates.

versus

HTTPS:HINDILINKS4U.TO & ORS. Defendants

Through: None.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER
% 24.07.2019**

I.A. 9851/2019 (Exemption)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

I.A. 9852/2019 (under Section 80 CPC)

2. Issue notice to the non applicants/Defendant Nos. 11 and 12 by all modes including email, returnable on 24th October 2019.

CS(COMM) 366/2019

3. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

Certified to be True Copy



**Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi of
Authorised Under Section 70
of the Evidence Act.**

4. Issue summons to Defendant No. 1 through email and to Defendant Nos. 2 to 12 through all modes, upon filing of Process Fee.

5. The summons to the Defendants shall indicate that a written statement to the plaintiff shall be filed positively within 30 days from date of receipt of summons. Along with the written statement, the Defendants shall also file an affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the Plaintiff, without which the written statement shall not be taken on record.

6. Liberty is given to the Plaintiff to file a replication within 15 days of the receipt of the written statement. 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 any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the timelines.

7. List before the Joint Registrar for marking of exhibits on 27th September 2019. It is made clear that any party unjustifiably denying documents would be liable to be burdened with costs.

8. List before Court on 24th October 2019.


I.A. 9850/2019 (U/O 39 Rule 1 & 2 CPC)

9. Issue notice to the Defendants by all modes including email, returnable on 24th October 2019.

10. The present suit has been filed for permanent injunction, rendition of accounts and damages etc. Plaintiff-Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc., is a Company incorporated at the state of Delaware, having its office at 4000 Warner Boulevard, Burbank, California 91522, United States of America.

11. Defendant No. 1, hindilinks4u.to (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant Website"), is an online location which enables users of the Defendant Website services to: (a) view (by a process known as "downloading") cinematograph films, being motion pictures, television programs or other audio-visual content, on devices connected to the Internet; (b) cause copies of those cinematograph films to be downloaded onto the memory of their devices for watching later or enabling others to watch or further copy those cinematograph films; and/or (c) identify other online locations including (by a process known as "linking") which enables those users to engage in the activities set out in (a) or (b).


12. It is stated in the plaint that Defendant Website is primarily and substantially engaged in communicating to the public, hosting, streaming and/or making available to the public Plaintiff's original content without authorization, and/or facilitating the same. Defendant No. 1 is making available, illegally and unauthorizedly, content of various third parties like UTV Software Communications Ltd., STAR India Pvt. Ltd., Disney Enterprises, Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc., Universal City Studios LLC., and Netflix Entertainment Services India LLP, etc. (hereinafter referred to as 'studios').

Certified to be True Copy

Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Madhya Pradesh
Authorized Under Section 19
Indian Evidence Act

13. It is further submitted that Plaintiff's films are works of visual recording and include sound recordings accompanying such visual recordings, which qualify as a "cinematograph film" under Section 2(f) of the Copyright Act, 1957 (hereinafter 'the Act'). Further, by virtue of Section 13(1) read with Section 13(2), Section 5 and Section 40 of the Act, the Plaintiff's cinematograph films whether released or not released in India would be entitled to all rights and protections granted under the Act for cinematograph films. The cinematograph films produced by the Plaintiff are "works" as defined under Section 2(y) of the Act, Plaintiff has all the rights in such cinematograph films granted under Section 14(d) of the Act, and Plaintiff is author and/or first owner and/or owners (under Section 17 of the Act) of the following illustrative list of cinematograph films that are entitled to protection under the Act:

S.No.	Film	Year
1.	Aquaman	2018
2.	A Star Is Born	2018
3.	Wonder Woman	2017
4.	Arrow, Season 7, Episode 22	2019

14. In order to protect and enforce their exclusive rights, the Plaintiff investigated and monitored the Defendant Website and gathered evidence of their infringing activity. During the period of investigation the Defendant Website infringed the Plaintiff's Original Content or facilitated the same, using or facilitating the use of the Defendant Website, inter alia, by

Certified to be True Copy

Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Judicature
Authorised Under Section 10
Indian Evidence Act

downloading and streaming the Plaintiff's Original Content. The illustrative list of illegal content made available by Defendant No. 1, that are entitled to protection under the Act are mentioned hereinbelow:

Studio	Film	Year
Columbia	Miracles from Heaven	2016
Columbia	This is the End	2013
DEI	Finding Dory	2016
DEI	The Jungle Book	2016
Paramount	Transformers: The Last Knight	2017
Paramount	Transformers: Age of Extinction	2014
Paramount	xXx: Return of Xander Cage	2017
Universal	Straight Outta Compton	2015
Universal	The Purge: Election Year	2016
Universal	The Secret Life of Pets	2016
Netflix	Stranger Things	2017-2019
Netflix	Santa Clarita Diet	2018-2019

15. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff submits that legal notice was served upon the Defendant Website calling upon them to cease from engaging in their infringing activities. Despite such legal notice, the Defendant Website continued to infringe the rights in Plaintiff's Original Content. The Defendant Website is therefore willfully infringing Copyright material and ignoring or failing to respond to notice to cease all infringement. He further submits that, access of the Defendant Website has been disabled in other

jurisdictions such as in Malaysia and Australia.

16 Learned Counsel for the Plaintiff submits that Defendant Website provides illegal content directly for free without any requirement of registration by users and such availability of content is supported by the advertisements featured on the website. The primary purpose of the Defendant Website is to commit or facilitate copyright infringement. Thus, Defendant No. 1 is liable for infringement under Section 51(a)(ii), Section 51(b), and Section 51(a)(i) for making a copy of the Original Content including the storing of it in any medium by electronic or other means and communicating the Original Content to the public. Further the hosting, streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public, and/or communicating to the public of the Original Content, or facilitating the same, without authorization of the Plaintiff amounts to violation of the Plaintiff's copyright work, protected under the Act. In support of his contentions reliance has also been placed on the decision of this court in *CS(COMM) 724/2017* dated 11th April, 2019, *UTV Software Communication Ltd. vs. 1337X.TO and Ors*

17. Plaintiff has arrayed various internet and telecom services providers (ISPs) as Defendant Nos. 2-10 (hereinafter "the said ISPs") in the present suit to ensure the effective implementation of any relief that this Hon'ble Court may grant in favour of the Plaintiff. The limited relief being claimed against the said ISPs is to ensure the effective implementation of any order that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant in favour of the Plaintiff by disabling access of the Defendant Website in India.


Verified to be True Copy
Examiner Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi of
Authorised Under Section 19
Indian Evidence Act

18. Plaintiff has also arrayed Defendant No. 11, the Department of Telecommunications (DoT), and Defendant No. 12, the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY), for a similar reason. The limited relief being claimed against the DoT and the MEITY is the issuance of a notification to the internet and telecom service providers registered with it to disable access into India of the Defendant Website.

19. In view of the averments noted hereinabove and in view of the judgment passed in *UTV Software Communication Ltd.* (supra), this Court is of the opinion that a prima facie case is made out in favour of the Plaintiff and balance of convenience is also in its favour. Further, irreparable harm or injury would be caused to the plaintiff if an interim injunction order is not passed.

20. Consequently, Defendant No. 1 their owners, partners, proprietors, officers, 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, are restrained from, hosting, streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and/or communicating to the public, or facilitating the same, in any manner, on their websites, through the internet any cinematograph work/content/programme/ show in relation to which Plaintiff has copyright.

21. Further, as held by this court in *UTV Software Communication Ltd.* (supra), in order for this court to be freed from constant monitoring and

Qualified to be True Copy

Examiner, Judicial Department
High Court of Delhi of
Authorised Under Section 19
Indian Evidence Act.

adjudicating the issues of mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites it is directed that as and when Plaintiff files an application under Order I Rule 10 for impleadment of such websites, Plaintiff shall file an affidavit confirming that the newly impleaded website is mirror/redirect/alphanumeric website with sufficient supporting evidence. Such application shall be listed before the Joint Registrar, who on being satisfied with the material placed on record, shall issue directions to the ISPs to disable access in India to such mirror/redirect/alphanumeric websites.

22. Defendant Nos. 2-10, shall ensure compliance of this order by blocking, hindilinks4u.to, its URL https://hindilinks4u.to with IP address, 104.27.162.170 and 104.27.163.170. Defendant Nos. 11 and 12 are directed to suspend the aforementioned domain name registration of Defendant No. 1 and issue requisite notifications calling upon various internet and telecom service providers registered under them to block the aforementioned website identified by Plaintiff.

23. Let provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC be complied by way of email within a period of one week.

sd

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JULY 24, 2019

nk

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL COMMERCIAL JURISDICTION)
CS(COMM) NO. 366 OF 2019

IN THE MATTER OF

Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.Plaintiff

Versus

[http:HINDILINKS4U.TO](http://HINDILINKS4U.TO) & OrsDefendants

MEMO OF PARTIES

Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.
4000 Warner Boulevard,Burbank
California 91522, United States of America
Email:antipiracy@warnerbros.comPlaintiff

Versus

- 1) <https://hindilinks4u.tu>
Email: hindilinks4u.net@domainsbyproxy.com
- 2) Atria Convergence Technologies Pvt. Ltd.
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
nodal.term@actcorp.in;
Jitesh.chathambil@actcorp.in

3) Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd.

Bharat Sanchar Bhawan, Regulation Cell
5th floor, Harish Chandra Mathur Lane
Janpath, New Delhi -110001
ddg_reg@bsnl.co.in; sbkhare@bsnl.co.in
averma@bsnl.co.in

4) Bharti Airtel Ltd.

Airtel Centre, Tower-A, 6th floor
'A' Wing, Plot No.16, Udyog Vihar
Ph - IV, Gurgaon – 122016
ravi.gandhi@airtel.in; 121@in.airtel.com; compliance.officer@bharti.in; compliance.officer@bharti.in; jyoti.pawar@in.airtel.com ; Ravi.gandhi@airtel.com

5) Hathway Cable & Datacom Pvt. Ltd.

'Rahejas', 4 floor, Main Avenue
Santacruz (W), Mumbai-400054
ajay.singh@hathway.net; dulal@hathway.net; Sudhir.shetye@hathway.net

6) Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd.

5th Floor, Mahanagar Doorsanchar Sadan
9, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road
New Delhi – 110003

raco.mtnl@gmail.com; mtnlcsco@gmail.com
gmracomtnl@gmail.com

7) Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited

RCP 14 (TC 23), Phase 4,
B-Block , 3rd Floor,
C 4 130 Twane- belapur Road,
Gansoli,
Navi Mumbai- 400701

Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com;

Kapoor.guliani@ril.com

8) 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
info@spectra.co; compliance@spectra.co

9) Tata Teleservices Ltd.

A, E & F Blocks

Voltas Premises - T. B. Kadam Marg

Chinchpokli, Mumbai – 400033

pravin.jogani@tatatel.co.in; anand.dalal@tatatel.co.in;

satya.yadav@tatatel.co.in

10) Vodafone India 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
smitha.menon@vodafoneidea.com,
saptansu.mitra@vodafoneidea.com
sanjeet.sarkar@vodafoneidea.com
lavati.sairam@vodafoneidea.com

11) Department of Telecommunications

Through Secretary,
Ministry of Communications and IT,
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,
New Delhi – 110001
secy-dot@nic.in, dirds2-dot@nic.in,

12) 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
gccyberlaw@meity.gov.in; cyberlaw@meity.gov.in

- 13-50) Ashok Kumars
- 51) Hindilinks4u.world
Email: abuse@namecheap.com
- 52) hindilinks4u.pro
Email: abuse@namecheap.com
- 53) hindilinks4u.tel
Email: abuse@namecheap.com
- 54) hindilinks4u.watch
Email: abuse@namecheap.com
- 55) hindilinks4u.icu
Email: abuse@namecheap.com

.....Defendants

Place: New Delhi
Date: 12th December 2022



Suhasini Raina (D/2982/2011)
Saikrishna & Associates
Counsels for the Plaintiff
57, Jor Bagh,
New Delhi-110003

SCHEDULE A

Injuncted Website Location (at Time of Suit as well as additionally impleaded websites)	URL of New Mirror/Redirect/ Alphanumeric Variation of Injuncted Website	Domain Name of Mirror/Redirect/ Alphanumeric Variation of Injuncted Website	IP Addresses of New Mirror/Redirect/Alphanumeric Variation of Injuncted Website
https://hindilinks4u. to hindilinks4u.world hindilinks4u.pro	https://hindilinks4u.watch	hindilinks4u.w atch	172.67.149.21 8
			104.21.29.224
	https://hindilinks4u.tel	hindilinks4u.tel	104.21.20.32
			172.67.191.72
	http://hindilinks4u.icu	hindilinks4u.ic u	104.21.20.32
			172.67.191.72