



\$~30

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

*Date of decision: 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2023*

+ **CS(COMM) 514/2023 and I.A. 14120/2023, 14122/2023**

UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS LLC. AND ORS. .... Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Saikrishna Rajagopal, Ms. Suhasini Raina, Ms. Anjali Agarwal, Ms. Mehr Sidhu, Mr. Raghav Goyal & Ms. R. Ramya, Adv. (M: 8879106222)

versus

DOTMOVIES.BABY AND ORS. .... Defendants

Through: Mr. Harish V. Shankar, CGSC for DOT and MeitY.

**CORAM:**

**JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH**

**Prathiba M. Singh (Oral)**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

**I.A. 14122/2023 (u/S 80 CPC)**

2. This is an application filed by the Plaintiffs, seeking exemption from serving notice to Defendant No. 26- Department of Telecommunications (DoT) and Defendant No. 27- Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY) under Section 80 of the CPC.

3. Exemption is allowed. However, Mr. Harish V. Shankar, ld. CGSC has been requested to accept notice.

4. Accordingly, application is disposed of.

**CS(COMM) 514/2023 & I.A. 14120/2023(u/O XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 CPC)**

5. The Plaintiffs before this Court are well-established Hollywood Studios which are engaged in the production, distribution of a large volume



of original creative content including cinematograph films, TV series, motion pictures, etc. (*hereinafter 'content'*). The list of Plaintiffs in the present petition is set out in the following table:

<b>Plaintiff No.</b>	<b>Name of the Plaintiff</b>
1.	Universal City Studios LLC.
2.	Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.
3.	Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.
4.	Netflix Studios, LLC
5.	Paramount Pictures Corporation
6.	Disney Enterprises, Inc.

6. The Plaintiffs claim that the content created, produced and distributed by, or on behalf of the Plaintiffs' studios, can be accessed and viewed on a variety of devices including Televisions, Personal Computers, laptops, Tablets, Mobile Phones, etc. The said gadgets also permit authorised streaming and downloading of this content. The Plaintiffs' studios own Copyright in the entire content which is protectable as cinematograph films and also own rights in various underlying works – which are recognised under the Copyright Act, 1957 (*hereinafter, 'the Act'*). The Plaintiffs also claim to have devoted enormous resources in the creation, production and distribution of the content, as also communication of the content so developed to the public. It is also stated that considerable effort and resources are used for even marketing and advertising of the content developed by the Plaintiffs.

7. Technology has posed a major challenge for entities like the Plaintiffs as there is a proliferation of a large number of platforms including websites




from where unauthorised, unlicensed and pirated content of the Plaintiffs can be downloaded, accessed and viewed by customers and viewers. The process of production of copyrighted content is a continuous one and almost on a daily basis new content is being added into the bouquet of content of the Plaintiffs. Thus, the content consisting of films, TV series, shows, etc. is itself dynamic in nature and the reproduction, hosting, uploading, streaming, downloading, broadcasting, telecasting or making available of this content in an unauthorized manner is, apart from constituting infringement of Copyright also resulting in enormous monetary loss to the Plaintiffs.

8. The present suit has been filed by the Plaintiffs against various websites which are permitting the viewing, streaming, accessing and downloading of such content without any license or authorisation from the Plaintiffs. The various websites which are impleaded as Defendant Nos. 1 to 16 have different avatars but continue to make available the unauthorised content of the Plaintiffs and also other copyright holders. Such websites primarily contain content which is being taken in an unauthorised manner, from various platforms including that of the Plaintiffs. Some of the websites are newer versions of rogue websites which have been enjoined in other litigation. Some of the glaring features of these rogue websites are as follows:

- i) No details are available as to the persons or entities who have registered the domain names and the websites have subscribed to features like privacy protect, to hide/mask their identity;
- ii) There is no clarity from a perusal of the websites as to who is the person or entity who is making available the content, which is being hosted, streamed or viewed on these websites;



- iii) There are no contact details and addresses which are available in most occasions, except e-mails addresses. Some of the websites are also providing advertising and thus generating revenue for themselves. These advertisements also include promotion of betting websites which also unlawfully lure customers and viewers;
- iv) The websites also have forms asking viewers and users to suggest more content that could be uploaded. For example, [www.dotmovies.baby](http://www.dotmovies.baby) has the following note below contact us has been given:



*“Feel Free to contact us*

*Please feel free to contact us regarding any need. We look forward to hearing from you. Also, you can post a request regarding new movies or TV Series. We will be more than happy to post your*



*favourite movies and TV series”*

Thus, the website, apart from hosting and making available illegal content, is enticing and welcoming viewers to suggest more and more titles that can be unauthorisedly made available.

- v) These websites provide different qualities of downloading, including High Definition (HD option). The website also provides different language and subtitling options depending upon the need of the user;
- vi) The content hosted or linked on the said websites are also downloadable on mobile phones and even support casting of content to other viewing devices using Chromecast;
- vii) The websites also have utilized content from OTT platforms and various regional language cinematograph films;
- viii) It also appears that the websites encourage users to join the platforms which support sharing of voluminous content such as Telegram, etc. in order to be able to communicate and transmit unauthorised content;
- ix) These websites are using varying alphanumeric addresses while maintaining the core name, for example - TamilMV. The TamilMV website was earlier injuncted in ***CS(COMM) 369/2019*** titled ***Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. v. www.tamilrockers.ws & Ors.*** However, it has now added the numeral 1 and has again started transmitting pirated/unauthorised content
- x) Some websites give different options to the user and also provide the genre of the content.



9. It has been observed that in the screenshot extracted above, which is inviting suggestions for pirating further content, the e-mail address mentioned is of [vegamoviesorg@gmail.com](mailto:vegamoviesorg@gmail.com) which is part of the name of another website that has already been enjoined by this Court vide order dated 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2022, in *CS(COMM) 265/2022* titled *Universal City Studios LLC & Ors. v Vegamovies.run & Ors.* The relevant extracts of the said order are extracted as under:

*“16. Defendants No. 1 to 12 include vegamovies.run, with the additional domains vegamovies.app, vegamovies.bar, vegamovies.cx, vegamovies.info, vegamovies.ink, vegamovies.nl and vegamovies.onl (Defendant No. 1); 0123movie.stream with the additional domains 0123movies.ltd, 123movie.lc, 123movies.college, 123movies.futbol, 123movies.click, 123movies.gl, 123-movies.win, 123-movies.sx, 123movies44.com, 123movies0.gr, 123moviesgo.io, 123moviesme.online, 123moviess.se and 123movies.net (Defendant No. 2); allmovieshub.de with the additional domains allmovieshub.pro, allmovieshub.mobi, allmovieshub.org.in and allmovieshub.pw (Defendant No. 3); hdhub4u.mom with the additional domains hdhub4u.top, hdhub4u.li, hdhub4u.mx, and hdhub4u.one (Defendant No. 4); mkvcinemas.bz with the additional domain mkvcinemas.nz (Defendant No. 5); movierulzhd.bar with the additional domains 7movierulz.do, moviesrulz.net, 4movierulz1.com, 7moviesrulz.com, movierulz2free.com, movierulz4k.com and 4movierulz.live (Defendant No. 6); moviesverse.club with the additional domains, moviesverse.biz, moviesverse.mobi, moviesverse.me, moviesverse.com and 9moviesverse.in (Defendant No. 7); putlocker99.me (Defendant No. 8); themoviesflix.com.mx with the additional domains themoviesflix.us.com and themoviesflix.com.ph (Defendant No. 9); unblockit.day with the additional*



*domains unblockit.cam and unblockit.how (Defendant No. 10); uwatchfree.so with the additional domains uwatchfree.fo, uwatchfree.do and uwatchfree.vg (Defendant No. 11); tamilblasters.buzz with additional domains tamilblasters.bid, tamilblasters.club, tamilblasters.com, tamilblasters.net, tamilblasters.re and tamilblasters.vin (Defendant No.12), hereinafter referred to as “Defendant Websites” collectively. It is contended that Defendant Websites are online locations which enable use of Defendant Websites’ services, without any authorisation or license from the Plaintiffs, to: (a) view (by a process known as streaming/ downloading) cinematograph films, 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 film, and/or (c) identify other online locations including (by a process known as “linking”) which enable those users to engage in the activities set out in (a) or (b). An illustrative list of illegal content made available by Defendants No.1 to 12 has been provided in para 30 of the plaint.*

xxx

xxx

xxx

*20. Having heard learned counsel for the Plaintiffs, this Court is of the view that Plaintiffs have made out a prima facie case for grant of ex parte ad-interim injunction. Balance of convenience lies in favour of the Plaintiffs and they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in case the injunction, as prayed for, is not granted.*”

10. After having perused the printouts of the various websites, this Court has no doubt in holding that such websites have the potential to curb creation of copyrighted content and hurt the thriving content creation industry in India and abroad, as they offer unlicensed/unauthorised alternate



platforms than those offered by the copyright owners themselves. Ignoring the existence of such rogue websites could result in curtailing and stifling creativity itself inasmuch as the creation of this content involves enormous investments and involves the collaborative work of various creative people such as authors, lyricists, singers, actors, dancers, musicians, support staff, extras etc. All these efforts and works would all be jeopardized if such pirated/unauthorised content is permitted to be available for users, that too at no cost or even minimal cost.

11. The Court had put a question to the Id. Counsel for the Plaintiffs as to how the dynamic generation of content can be protected in a suit where even future works of the Plaintiffs' can be covered. Mr. Saikrishna, Id. Counsel has taken the Court through the decision of this Court in ***UTV Software Communication Ltd. and Ors v. 1337x.to and Ors, (2019) 78 PTC 375 (Del)*** where this aspect is considered by the Court as under:

*“16. He pointed out that there were at least 122 other movies of the plaintiffs on [www4.fmovies.to](http://www4.fmovies.to). Learned Amicus Curiae stated that the plaintiffs had not fully checked their own movies on the said website, let alone third-party content. He contended that the least due diligence expected of the plaintiffs was to provide evidence of at least all of their own movies, if not of third parties (though expected) that were illegally available on the impugned websites.*

*17. He submitted that the “three-step verification test” evolved by the Bombay High Court in *Eros International Media v. BSNL, Suit No. 751 of 2016*, which consisted of verification by an independent entity, extensive documents being placed on record and an affidavit on oath, was not satisfied in the present case. He contended that the evidence of the nature envisaged by courts was lacking in the present case.*





The relevant portion of the orders in Eros International Media (supra) relied upon by Mr. Hemant Singh are reproduced hereinbelow:-

a) Order dated 22nd July, 2016

“2. I am making it clear that I will not grant an injunction or order to block URLs that point to websites unless it is demonstrated that the entirety of the website contains, and contains only, illicit material. Without that being attested to and established on Affidavit, I will not consider an order that results in the blocking of an entire website.

b) Order dated 26th July, 2016

“14. Thus, what I have before me now is a three-step verification. First, a verification and an assessment by Aiplex (Plaintiff). This is accompanied by their letter in writing. There is then a second level of verification that is said to have been done by the deponent of the Affidavit along with the Plaintiffs' Advocates; and finally all of this material is placed on Affidavit and is now on oath. I think this is sufficient material on which to base an order.”

xxx

xxx

xxx

**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.**

xxx

xxx

xxx

**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 injuncted.** 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.”

12. In *UTV Software Communication Ltd. (Supra)*, the Id. Single Judge of this Court took note of the dynamic nature in which the duplication of websites can happen, especially because mirror websites can spring up within a matter of a few minutes. Several other orders have also been passed by this Court with respect to rogue websites, such as in *CS(COMM) 157/2022* titled *Star India Pvt. Ltd v. Live Flixhub.Net*, *CS(COMM) 471/2019* titled *Star India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Moviemad.biz & Ors*, and *CS(COMM) 195/2019* titled *Star India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Extramovies.host & Ors*. These orders have clearly established that these websites surface frequently, and on a periodic basis, as domain names can be registered with



minor modifications, and the content of the website can be very easily moved from one website to the other.

13. Piracy and unauthorized reproduction of copyrighted content is a serious issue the world over. In view of the easy and affordable access to the internet across the globe, copyright owners are forced to take action in different jurisdictions, that are material to their revenue in order to seek injunctions against rogue websites, which offer content in an unauthorised manner. Courts across the world have been providing various remedies in order to protect the rights of copyright owners. For instance, in *The Football Association Premier League v. British Telecommunications PLC and Ors.*, [2017] EWHC 480 (Ch), the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, U.K., vide judgement dated 13<sup>th</sup> March, 2017, had passed orders directing ISPs to block access to the websites distributing, transmitting and streaming unauthorised content of the Barclays Premier League matches. In the said decision, the Court considered various issues such as proportionality and safeguards including the avoidance of barriers to legitimate trade before passing the orders of blocking.

14. In addition to the decision in *The Football Association Premier League (supra)*, in several decisions, various torrent websites such as ‘The Pirate Bay’, ‘KAT’, ‘Fenopy’ and ‘H33T’ which were rampantly indulging in copyrights infringement were directed to be blocked through a series of judgements. The said series of judgements include *Dramatico Entertainment Ltd v British Sky Broadcasting Ltd* [2012] EWHC 268 (Ch) and *EMI Records Ltd v British Sky Broadcasting Ltd* [2013] EWHC 379 (Ch). Further, the High Court of Ireland has in judgement dated 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2010 in *EMI Records [Ireland] Ltd & Ors v. UPC*



*Communications Ireland Ltd, [2010] IEHC 377* highlighted the nature of the problem being faced by the creative industry as also the economic issues that arise due to rogue websites. The relevant extracts of the said judgement are set out below:

*“The Nature of the Problem*

8. *I am satisfied that the **business of the recording companies is being devastated by internet piracy. This not only undermines their business but ruins the ability of a generation of creative people in Ireland, and elsewhere, to establish a viable living. It is destructive of an important native industry.** While the evidence focussed on the recording industry, the retail sector must also be affected by this wholesale theft. Furthermore, the evidence presented convinces me that a substantial portion of the generation now in their teenage years and twenties are actively dissuaded by illegal alternatives from legitimately purchasing music.*

xxx            xxx            xxx

*Economic Issues*

xxx            xxx            xxx

19. ***More widely, however, internet piracy is an economic and a moral problem.** Were men to walk into a cinema and in the dark, set up a small tripod for a machine to digitally record the latest movie blockbuster, to use the appropriate colloquial terminology, most right thinking people would be appalled. To entertain themselves and their families at home, they would have to wait three or four months to buy the DVD on its release and spend about €15 to have the film and whatever extras were added on to make it attractive. It is hardly credible that cinema owners would not be aware of this problem taking place. If they did nothing, and allowed people to proceed with illegally capturing the film, the first step*



would have been taken with their acquiescence in the undermining of Copyright. Attendance at the film would plummet, because a group of friends would be drawn into deciding that a cheaper alternative for say five or ten of them, instead of having to spend between €50 and €100 on cinema admission, would be to buy a pirated copy of the film and watch it in the comfort of their home on the now almost ubiquitous flat screen television of large size that graces our home life. If nothing were done about the men, their camera and their tripod, their digital reproduction equipment and their sales, on the release of the DVD of the film, legal purchases would be minimal. Similarly, in the week of commencing writing this, the National Youth Orchestra of Ireland presented a stirring new composition, 'Summer Overture' by Shaun Davey, in the National Concert Hall. . Nowadays it is possible to attend a concert and to have CDs of it legally for sale fifteen minutes after conclusion. A person could covertly capture the music on a small digital recorder. If that individual went out to a van in which he had a great deal of digital copying equipment, reproduced it without permission and sold the CDs to those leaving the concert, it would rightly be regarded as flagrant abuse of Copyright. **I cannot see how an illegal recording on site and the subsequent public or internet offering for free, with no return to the composer or performer for their creativity, is anything other than a scandal.** I have no doubt that any responsible cinema owner, or concert hall owner would stop internet piracy, if made aware of it. I am further satisfied that a reasonable person in that position would be vigilant to prevent it in a cinema or in a concert venue. **A failure to address those problems, by those who can address the abuse, is not excusable. It constitutes the abuse of the economic interests of the creative community. This kind of theft is shameful. Many who see that activity on the street would shun the**



commerce of exploiting the rights of artists for no return. Peer pressure would prevent much of it. But the internet allows a dispensation from shame, as internet thieves figure that no one will know what is being done behind the closed doors of internet access. Essentially, that coupled with the failure of internet service providers to act like a responsible cinema or concert venue owner would act, is why the problem is so extreme

20. There is no difference between the public situations I have described and the piracy of music tracks over the internet. It has the same consequence. The conduit for that illegal activity is, however, not the street or the pavement outside a cinema; it is the internet service providers. It is clear that they have an economic and moral obligation to address the problem. I do not accept any of the evidence from UPC, referred to later in this judgment, as to why this has not been done. Instead, the effect on the market place of illegal downloads, through the internet, is to increase the profit levels of internet service providers. Relevant correspondence from within UPC is profoundly disturbing as to the reality of their approach.

21. The evidence establishes that this problem is a massive one. This is an instance where the multiplication on a huge scale of small problems has changed the nature of the issue into a huge pilfering of the resources of creative artists. For each individual person, the number of downloads cannot be regarded as being on a commercial scale. It is the multiplication of the problem through millions of individuals feeling free to use the internet to pirate the Copyright of creative artists and recording companies that has created the undermining of that right on a foundational scale.”

15. Even in India, regularly orders are being passed by Courts, against websites which consist of unauthorized and illegal content, in an effort to



combat the scourge of internet/network piracy. Recently, the Bombay High Court in *Applause Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. v. Meta Platforms Inc., 2023 SCC OnLine Bom 1034*, has directed the blocking of all social media accounts which were being used for communicating substantial parts of a web series hosted on an OTT platform. In the said decision, while apprehending that continuation of such unauthorised dissemination using different names and identities, the Court issued an *ex-parte ad-interim* dynamic injunction, restraining even the adoption of different identities to perpetuate such unauthorised dissemination. The only effective measure at this stage, which domestic courts are therefore granting is blocking of these websites and extension of the injunction to mirror websites even if they are with alphanumeric variations.


16. The dynamism of the injunction, by itself, in one country or another may not, however be sufficient to protect copyright owners. There is an imminent need to evolve a global consensus in this regard inasmuch as despite ISPs blocking these websites, the said websites can be accessed through VPN servers, and other methods to which the long arm of the law cannot extend etc.

17. Any injunction granted by a Court of law ought to be effective in nature. The injunction ought to also not merely extend to content which is past content created prior to the filing of the suit but also to content which may be generated on a day-to-day basis by the Plaintiffs. In a usual case for copyright infringement, the Court firstly identifies the work, determines the Copyright of the Plaintiff in the said work, and thereafter grants an injunction. However, owing to the nature of the illegalities that rogue websites indulge in, there is a need to pass injunctions which are also



dynamic *qua* the Plaintiffs as well, as it is seen that upon any film or series being released, they may be immediately uploaded on the rogue websites, causing severe and instant monetary loss. Copyright in future works comes into existence immediately upon the work being created, and Plaintiffs may not be able to approach the Court for each and every film or series that is produced in the future, to secure an injunction against piracy.

18. Some of the websites, as seen from the printouts placed on record, in fact encourage users not to obtain subscription plans of legitimate platforms and also ask users for suggestions as to which content should be uploaded. One such website is of Defendant No. 6- [seriesonlinehd.tv](http://seriesonlinehd.tv) where the website has a note to the following effect:



*“Why spend your hard earned cash on cable or Netflix when you can stream hd movies and series had at no cost?*

*More and more people cut the cord because entertainment on demand sounds more tempting. And more and more people stop purchasing a subscription plan because they can get the same service at free online movie streaming sites. At Seriesonlinehd.tv, you can watch any movie of your choice without paying a penny or even signing up. With a huge collection of movies and TV series, Seriesonlinehd.tv is confident to meet your entertainment needs and even exceed your*





*expectations. With HD quality and mobile friendly and Chromecast supported features, Seriesonlinehd.tv is your best alternative to cable and paid streaming services”*

19. As innovation in technology continues, remedies to be granted also ought to be calibrated by Courts. This is not to say that in every case, an injunction *qua* future works can be granted. Such grant of an injunction would depend on the fact situation that arises and is placed before the Court.

20. In the facts and circumstances as set out above, an *ex parte ad interim* injunction is granted restraining the Defendants, who are all rogue websites, from in any manner streaming, reproducing, distributing, making available to the public and/or communicating to the public any copyrighted content of the Plaintiffs including future works of the Plaintiffs, in which ownership of copyright is undisputed, through their websites identified in the suit or any mirror/redirect websites or alphanumeric variations thereof including those websites which are associated with the Defendants’ websites either based on the name, branding, identity or even source of content. To keep pace with the dynamic nature of the infringement that is undertaken by hydra-headed websites, this Court has deemed it appropriate to issue this **‘Dynamic+ injunction’** to protect copyrighted works as soon as they are created, to ensure that no irreparable loss is caused to the authors and owners of copyrighted works, as there is an imminent possibility of works being uploaded on rogue websites or their newer versions immediately upon the films/shows/series etc. The Plaintiffs are permitted to implead any mirror/redirect/alphanumeric variations of the websites identified in the suit as Defendants Nos. 1 to 16 including those websites which are



associated with the Defendants Nos. 1 to 16, either based on the name, branding, identity or even source of content, by filing an application for impleadment under Order I Rule 10 CPC in the event such websites merely provide new means of accessing the same primary infringing websites that have been enjoined. The Plaintiffs are at liberty to also file an appropriate application seeking protection *qua* their copyrighted works, including future works, if the need so arises. Upon filing such applications before the Registrar along with an affidavit with sufficient supporting evidence seeking extension of the injunction to such websites, to protect the content of the Plaintiffs, including future works, the injunction shall become operational against the said websites and *qua* such works. If there is any work in respect of which there is any dispute as to ownership of copyright, an application may be moved by the affected party before the Court, to seek clarification.

21. Insofar as Defendant Nos.17 to 25 are concerned, the said ISPs shall give effect to this injunction by blocking the said websites. MeitY and DoT shall issue blocking orders against the websites within a period of one week from the release of the order.

22. The Domain Name Registrars (DNRs) of the rogue websites' domain names, upon being intimated by the Plaintiffs shall lock and suspend the said domain names. In addition, any details relating to the registrants of the said domain names including KYC, credit card, mobile number, etc. be also provided to the Plaintiffs.

23. For a ready reference of the names of the Defendant websites, the list of Defendant websites as given in the memo of parties of this suit is attached to the present order as **Annexure A**.

24. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC be effected within two



weeks. Compliance and service is permitted through e-mail owing to the fact that the exact contact details or addresses of these parties are not known.

25. Reply to the application be filed within four weeks from the service of the present order along with the paper book.

26. List before the Joint Registrar on 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2023.

27. List before the Court on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2024.

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH**  
**JUDGE**

**AUGUST 9, 2023/Rahul/am**  
*(corrected & released on 17<sup>th</sup> August, 2023)*



### Annexure A

#### List of Defendants as per Memo of Parties

Defendant Nos.	Websites/Party Name	Contact Details
1	dotmovies.baby dotmovies. wiki dotmovies. bio dotmovies.ink dotmovies.xyz	abuse@namecheap.com vegamoviesorg@gmail.com
2	1tamilmv.kids 1tamilmv.cafe	abuse@namecheap.com
3	tamilvip.city tamilvip.tv	domainabuse@tucows.com compliance@tucows.com
4	kissasian.link kissasian.land kissasian.mx kissasian.li kissasian. pe	renzuken08@gmail.com abuse@namesilo.com noreply@data-protected.net
5	filmyworlds.pro filmyworlds.online filmyworlds.life filmyworld.cc	Filmyworld111@proton.me abuse@namecheap.com
6	seriesonlinehd.tv	abuse@namecheap.com
7	deadtoons.co	contactzylith@proton.me abuse@namecheap.com



8	full4movies.bet full4movies.expert full4movies.cafe full4movies.golf full4movies.tech	abuse@namecheap.com
9	hindmoviez.icu hindmoviez.app hindmoviez.wiki	hindmoviez@gmail.com abuse@namecheap.com
10	9xflix.win 9xflix.qpon 9xflix.help	9xflix@protonmail.com abuse@namesilo.com abuse@tldregistrarsolutions.com abuse@namecheap.com
11	goku.sx goku.to	compliance@epag.de
12	cataz.net	abuse@namecheap.com f573f9c9248a4d2b9dbaaad660ebda7c. protect@Withheldforprivacy.com
13	popmovies.top	abuse@namecheap.com
14	asianhdplay.pro asianhdplay.net	abuse@namecheap.com
15	moviesyug.info moviesyug.org	abuse@name.com
16	bingewatch.to	noc@cloudflare.com