



\$~46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 713/2025**
TWENTY-FOUR FRAMES FACTORY PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Neha Khanduri and Mr. Achal Mittal, Advocates.

versus

JOHN DOE & ORS

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Varun Pathak, Mr. Akhil Shandilya and Mr. Mrityunjay Roy, Advocates for D-2 and 3.

Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC with Mr. Arnav Mittal and Mr. Om Ram, Advocate for D-5 and 6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER
21.07.2025

%

I.A. 17023/2025 (for pre-institution mediation)

1. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Section 12-A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 read with Section 151 of CPC seeking exemption from Pre-Institution Mediation.
2. Having regard to the facts of the present case wherein urgent relief is prayed and in light of the judgment of Supreme Court in ***Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Keerthi, (2024) 5 SCC 815***, as also Division Bench of this Court in ***Chandra Kishore Chaurasia v. RA Perfumery Works Private Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 3529***, exemption is granted to the Plaintiff from Pre-Institution Mediation.



3. Application is allowed and disposed of.

I.A. 17024/2025 (u/S 149 of CPC)

4. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff seeking extension of time in filing Court fee.

5. For the reasons stated in the application, Plaintiff is permitted to file requisite Court fees within a period of four weeks from today.

6. Application is allowed and disposed of.

I.A. 17025/2025 (u/S 151 of CPC)

7. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff seeking exemption from advance service to Defendants No. 1, 7 to 14.

8. On account of the urgent relief prayed for by the Plaintiff which needs hearing today, Plaintiff is exempted from serving advance notice on the said Defendants.

9. Application is allowed and disposed of.

CS(COMM) 713/2025

10. Let plaint be registered as a suit.

11. At the outset, learned counsel for the Plaintiff seeks to delete Defendant No. 3 from the array of parties.

12. Defendant No. 3 is deleted from the array of parties.

13. Amended Memo of Parties be filed within two weeks from today.

14. Issue summons.

15. Counsels, as above, accept summons on behalf of respective Defendants.

16. Written statements shall be filed by Defendant Nos. 2, 5 and 6 within 30 days from the receipt of summons along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.



17. It is open to the Plaintiff to file replications within 30 days from receipt of the written statements along with affidavit of admission/denial of documents filed by the Defendant Nos. 2, 5 and 6.

18. Upon filing of process fee, issue summons to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes, returnable before the learned Joint Registrar on 26.09.2025.

19. Written statements shall be filed by the Defendants within 30 days from the receipt of summons along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.

20. It is open to the Plaintiff to file replications within 30 days from receipt of the written statement along with affidavit of admission/denial of documents filed by the Defendants.

21. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same be done in accordance with Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

22. The Joint Registrar shall carry out admission/denial of documents and marking of exhibits.

I.A. 17022/2025 (u/O XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 r/w Section 151 of CPC)

23. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC for grant of *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction.

24. Issue notice.

25. Counsels, as above, accept notice on behalf of respective Defendants.

26. Upon filing of process fee, issue notice to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes, returnable before Court on 19.09.2025.

27. Plaintiff is stated to be a production house established by Dr. M.



Mohan Babu, a renowned actor, producer and educationist. The production house is dedicated to developing and producing cinematic movies and other content. Plaintiff houses numerous creative visionaries, seasoned film makers and content creators to produce one of the finest cinematographic films.

28. It is averred that Plaintiff produced the film Kannappa which is one of the most ambitious projects of Mr. Babu and the film is based on religious folklore about Lord Shiva and his devoted follower, capturing the journey of the follower and his transformation in exploring spirituality. The film has a line up of reputed film actors and the streaming and other related rights relating to exploitation of the film have been licensed to various distributors and aggregators. It is Plaintiff's case that by virtue of Sections 13(b) and 14(d) of the Copyright Act, 1957, Plaintiff is the owner of the copyright in the film and thus has an exclusive right to exploit the same. Plaintiff has invested huge capital on the making of the film as new technological techniques and graphic capabilities have been used.

29. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff submits that the Defendants including social media platforms such as Defendants No. 2 to 4 and rogue websites as impleaded in the suit are engaging in flagrant copyright infringement by hosting and sharing pirated content including full movie, reels and clips. This unauthorized activity, amplified by rapid viewership in the millions, undermines and adversely impacts Plaintiff's commercial interests, disrupts contractual obligations with distributors and causes irreparable reputational harm to the Plaintiff. She submits that an anti-piracy agency representing the Plaintiff has reported 1776 infringing links on Meta platforms of which only 191 have so far been removed. In this backdrop,



Plaintiff was compelled to file the present suit seeking dynamic injunction to ensure blocking of infringing content, revocation of rogue website domain registrations and disclosure of registrant details so that proceedings under law can be taken apart from claim for damages.

30. Learned counsel for Defendant No. 2, appearing on advance copy of the application submits that as per Plaintiff's own showing 191 infringing links have been removed and the answering Defendant is ready to abide by any further direction passed by this Court.

31. Having heard learned counsel for the Plaintiff and learned counsel for Defendant No. 2, this Court is of the view that Plaintiff has made out a *prima facie* case for grant of *ex parte ad-interim* injunction. Balance of convenience lies in favour of the Plaintiff and it is likely to suffer irreparable harm in case the injunction, as prayed for, is not granted.

32. Accordingly, Defendant No. 2/Meta Platforms Inc. is directed to take down and disable the URLs hosting the infringing videos on Instagram and Facebook (mentioned at pages 176 to 212) and Defendant No. 4/X Corp. shall take down and disable the URL mentioned at page 213, in accordance with the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.

33. Plaintiff shall comply with provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC *qua* Defendant No. 4 within one week from today.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JULY 21, 2025

S.Sharma/Shivam