



\$~1

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

+ **W.P.(C) 16833/2024**

RAHUL BAJAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

MYTHRI MOVIE MAKERS AND ORS

.....Respondent

Through: Appearance not given

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

19.02.2026

1. The petition is for following reliefs:

“A. Issue a direction to Respondent No. 1 to ensure the release of the movie Pushpa 2: The Rule with accessibility features, specifically audio description (AD) and same-language closed captioning (CC)/Indian Sign Language, across cinema theatres, Over-the-Top (OTT) streaming platforms and all other media formats, in compliance with the Guidelines of Accessibility Standards in the Public Exhibition of Feature Films in Cinema Theatres issued by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting on March 15, 2024;

B. Issue a direction to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to effectuate the implementation of said accessibility features, including the installation of appropriate assistive devices and technologies in theatres, to ensure adherence to the guidelines and enable universal access;

C. Impose a fine of INR 1,00,000 on Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 each under section 89 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, for contravening the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016;

D. Award the cost of the present litigation, amounting to INR 50,000 to



the Petitioner; and

E. Issue a direction to Respondent No. 3 to periodically publish requisite information that would help in tracking compliance with the Guidelines dated 15.03.2024 and particularly the details as to the films certified with or without accessibility features.

F. Issue a direction to Respondent No. 2 to withhold clearances for digital ticket-booking platforms that are inaccessible and do not exhibit accessibility information and to suitably act against existing platforms that do not comply with such requirements.

G. Grant any other relief(s) that this Hon'ble Court deems just, equitable, and appropriate in the factual matrix and legal framework governing this matter.”

2. Pursuant to the liberty granted by the Court, Mr. Bajaj, petitioner in person has placed on record written submissions dated 21.01.2026. Under the background of the present case the petitioner places the following suggestions for consideration of this Court. Paragraph no. 6.1 to 6.8 of the written submissions is extracted as under:

“6.1. That there exists no independent mechanism for persons with disabilities to know the films which are released in theaters that contain accessibility features viz. audio description, same language captioning and Indian sign language. And that persons with disabilities are left in the lurch in absence of the said information in making an informed choice on whether to book a ticket for the movie or not.

6.2. That consequently, there exists no information on downloading the relevant application and/or using relevant hardware to access accessibility features and using relevant assistive technologies to access any of the accessibility features which are imbedded as part of the digital cinema package i.e. the standard digital format used for delivery of the films to cinemas worldwide.

6.3. That similarly, there exists no details of the relevant service provider who may be reached out in case of any technical support that the persons with disabilities may require in accessing the relevant accessibility features in any of the movies which are released in theaters with accessibility features.

6.4. That under the second Schedule to the Allocation of Business



Rules, 1961, at page 180, in clause (B) at Sr. No. 4, the note read with Rule 15(2) of the Rights of Persons With Disabilities Rules, 2017, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology is the nodal ministry to ensure compliance with accessibility standards for information and communication technology based applications which are used for (i) bookings of movie tickets; and (i) delivery of accessibility features during screening of the movies in theaters. And that accordingly, the ministry is required to ensure that all such apps comply with accessibility standards which would make the apps themselves accessible for use by persons with disabilities prior to their launch. The ministry should be directed to ensure compliance with the Allocation of Business Rules as well as with Rule 15 (2) of the Rights of Persons With Disabilities Rules, 2017 qua all establishments.

6.5. That the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting must clarify the benchmarks it uses to determine suitability of the software / application as mentioned in clause 6.2 of the guidelines referenced in annexure P-5 of the Writ Petition. And that in absence of the said mechanism, this Court must direct the ministry to prescribe such a mechanism. Further, the ministry must direct all such solutions which provide accessibility features for movies screened in theaters to be made available universally across screens and for all regular and usual shows.

6.6. That the Central Board of Film Certification should be directed to ensure that as part of the condition of the certification, the producer of the film must be directed to ensure that accessibility features are available for regular shows and usual screenings universally across the theaters as mandated under clauses 5.4 (i) and (ii) respectively.

6.7. That Rule 22(4)(d) of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 2024 mandates furnishing the same language subtitles, same language audio description, or same language closed options, as a pre-requisite to certification; however, in practice, compliance has been narrowed to the provision of English captions alone, excluding a vast majority of Indian audiences. Same-language captions in the original language(s) of the film are, are for instance, a core accessibility requirement for persons who are deaf or hard of hearing and are a recognised aid for literacy and language learning with established universal benefits.

The Central Board of Film Certification must therefore be directed to enforce Rule 22(4)(d) in spirit, requiring producers to furnish same language accessibility features, and not only English captions.

6.8. That the Central Board of Film Certification must be directed to modify its website's film search database to clearly display, alongside each certified film, the accessibility features present for each certified movie (basis which the film was certified). Such disclosure is a minimal and administratively feasible obligation flowing directly from CBC's certification function and is necessary to give effect to Rule 22(4)(d) of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 2024 and Clauses 1.2, 6.3



and 8.1 of the Film Guidelines.”

3. The aforesaid suggestions have also been tabulated in Paragraph 6.9 is extracted as under:

<i>S.no</i>	<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Relevant Provision</i>
1.	<i>Independent mechanism for persons with disabilities to know the movies that contain accessibility features prior to making ticket booking through movie ticketing apps and websites</i>	<i>Rule 22(4)(d) of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 2024 read with Clauses 1.2, 6.3 and 8.1 of the Film Guidelines</i>
2.	<i>Availability of information to access accessibility features through the relevant apps providing facility to access accessibility features imbedded in the film</i>	<i>Rule 22(4)(d) of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 2024 read with Clauses 1.2, 6.3 and 8.1 of the Film Guidelines read with Clause 12.2 of Indian Stand</i>
3.	<i>Details of service provider providing accessibility features in films for any technical support that persons with disabilities may require</i>	<i>Clause 12.2 of Indian Standard 17802 published by Bureau of Indian Standards and prescribed for compliance under Rule 15(1)(c)(iii) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017</i>
4.	<i>Mechanism to ensure deployment of accessibility compliant apps and websites prior to their launch by MEITY</i>	<i>Second Schedule at page 180 in Clause (B) Department for Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, note to Sr. No. 4 of Allocation of Business Rules, 1961 (as amended) and Rule 15(2) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017</i>
5.	<i>MIB to clarify the benchmarks for suitability of applications and softwares as well as universal</i>	<i>Clauses 5.4 and 6.2 of the Film Guidelines</i>



	<i>availability of accessibility features across theaters during regular shows and usual screening</i>	
6.	<i>CBFC to ensure that all applications for certification mandatorily accompany the same language subtitles, same language audio description, or same language closed captions, if any, and any other accessibility features as may be notified from time to time by the Central Government. For this purpose, "same language" means the original language of the film concerned and this requirement cannot be fulfilled if the accessibility features are supplied only in English or any other language which is not the original language of the film</i>	<i>Rule 22(4)(d), Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 20</i>
7.	<i>Public searchable disclosure by CBFC of certified accessibility features for each film</i>	<i>Clauses 1.2 & 8.1 of the Film Guidelines</i>

4. It is thus seen that the suggestions, so far as continuing in Paragraph No.6.1 to 6.3 and 6.5 are concerned it will have to be implemented by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The suggestions which are contained in paragraph 6.4 will have to be implemented by Ministry of Electronics and Technology. The respondent No.3-The Central Board of Film Certification will have to consider the suggestions contained in Paragraph no. 6.1 to 6.8.

5. In view thereof let all the aforesaid respondents/stakeholders to implement the suggestions given by the petitioner with due expedition.

6. If for any reason any of the suggestion is not implemented, let the



specific reason be assigned by way of an affidavit of the Competent Authority.

7. List on 07.05.2026.

FEBRUARY 19, 2026
JYH/mj

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J