$~O-19

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

\# **CNR No. DLHC010803812024**

\+ **CS(COMM) 1018/2024, I.A. 45137/2024 and I.A. 8733/2026**

Date of decision**: 29.09.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:-

ANI MEDIA PVT LTD
THROUGH ITS AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:
MR. RAJESH JAIN
REGISTERED OFFICE AT:
6G , VANDANA BUILDING,
TOLSTOY MARG ,
NEW DELHI- 110001 .....Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Lahar Jain, Advocate.

versus

1. **RSY NEWS**
THROUGH ITS AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE/SOLE PROPRIETOR:
MR. RAJ KUMAR
602, B BLOCK
RADHIKA APARTMENT , EXHIBITION ROAD
PATNA , BIHAR , INDIA -800001.

2. **GOOGLE LLC**
ATTENTION: COPYRIGHT AGENT AT YOUTUBE
THROUGH ITS RESIDENT GRIEVANCE OFFICER:
MR. SURAJ RAO
REGISTERED OFFICE AT:
GOOGLE LLC - INDIA LIAISON OFFICE
UNIT NO . 26
THE EXECUTIVE CENTER ,
LEVEL 8, DLF CENTRE,
SANSAD MARG,
CONNAUGHT PLACE ,

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

NEW DELHI - 110001

.....Defendants

Through: D-1 ex parte.
Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Mr. Rohan Ahuja, Ms.Shruttima, Ms.Aishwarya and Ms. Jahanvi, Advocates for D-2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

CS(COMM) 1018/2024 and I.A. 8733/2026 (for summary judgment)

1. The plaintiff, ANI Media Pvt. Ltd., has instituted the present suit seeking permanent and mandatory injunction, damages and other consequential reliefs against defendant no. 1, RSY News, in respect of the unauthorised reproduction and publication, on four YouTube channels operated by it, of video works in which the plaintiff claims copyright. Defendant no. 2, Google LLC, which owns and operates the platform YouTube, has been impleaded as the intermediary hosting the impugned content.

2. By way of I.A. 8733/2026, preferred under Order XIII-A of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (**"CPC"**), as applicable to commercial disputes, read with Rule 27 of the Delhi High Court Intellectual Property Rights Division Rules, 2022 (**"IPD Rules"**), the plaintiff seeks a summary judgment and a decree in the suit. Since the adjudication of the application would dispose of the suit itself, the application and the suit are being taken up together.

3. Defendant No. 2 is represented through its counsel. Defendant No. 1,

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

who is the contesting defendant, has already been proceeded *ex parte*. On 20.08.2026, learned counsel for the plaintiff gave up prayer (e) made in the suit, which sought a direction to defendant no. 2 to take down or delete all the YouTube channels owned and managed by defendant no. 1. The application bearing I.A. 8733/2026, therefore, deals with the remaining prayers for summary judgment.

4. The prayers made in paragraph 62 of the plaint, to the extent they survive for consideration, read as under:

> *"(a) Pass a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction against the Defendant No. 1, restraining it from posting, publishing, uploading, distributing, republishing on any platform, or using in any manner, Plaintiff's Original Videos, or any other copyrighted work or content of the Plaintiff, including on the platform YouTube maintained by Defendant No. 2;*
>
> *(b) Pass a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction against the Defendant No. 1, directing it to take down the Infringing Videos to the extent that it uses, in any manner, the Plaintiff's Original Videos, or any other copyrighted work or content of the Plaintiff, including on the platform YouTube maintained by Defendant No. 2;*
>
> *or alternatively*
>
> *Pass a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction against the Defendant No. 1 or its agents or any person acting on its behalf of or under its authority, directing it to remove and take down the Infringing Videos, or any other content infringing the copyrighted work of the Plaintiff, including its Original Videos;*
>
> *(c) Pass a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction against Defendant No. 2 to de-index, take-down, block and disable access to the infringing content published by Defendant No. 1 on their platform, particularly the Infringing Videos, available at the link(s) below:*
>
> *(d) Pass a decree directing Defendant No. 1 to publish prominently a statement on YouTube and other social media platforms, acknowledging, and accepting that the Original Videos are produced by the Plaintiff and that Defendant No. 1 has illegally reproduced them in the Infringing Videos;*
>
> *(f) Pass a decree for damages against the Defendant No. 1, directing them to pay an amount of INR 2,00,00,500/- (Rupees Two Crore Five Hundred*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

Only) to the Plaintiff;

(g) Cost of this suit and consequent litigation be awarded to the Plaintiff; and

(h) Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper, against the Defendants and in favour of the Plaintiff."

5. The plaintiff describes itself as a multimedia news agency providing a syndicated news feed under the brand names "Asian News International" and "ANI". It is stated that, since its inception in 1971, the plaintiff has engaged journalists and camerapersons across more than one hundred bureaus in India, South Asia and elsewhere for reporting and creating video content in relation to news events. The plaintiff claims over seven million subscribers on YouTube and over eight million followers on the platform X, and asserts that news channels, newspapers and other news agencies subscribe to its syndicated feed for valuable consideration.

6. Defendant No. 1, RSY News, is stated to be a purported news agency having its place of business at 602, B Block, Radhika Apartment, Exhibition Road, Patna, Bihar. It operates four YouTube channels, namely, "RSY News", "RSY News UP", "RSY News Delhi" and "RSY News Bihar", which, at the time of institution of the suit, had more than four million subscribers combined. Defendant No. 2, Google LLC, owns and controls the platform YouTube, on which defendant no. 1 runs these channels.

7. The record discloses that between 17.08.2024 to 27.10.2024, defendant no. 1 uploaded twelve videos (**"Infringing Videos"**) on its aforesaid channels, reproducing, in whole or in substantial part, ten videos of the plaintiff (**"Original Videos"**), without any licence, permission or consent of the plaintiff. The particulars pleaded in paragraphs 11 to 41 of the plaint, including the respective dates, durations and timestamps, are

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

tabulated hereunder:

S. No.	Plaintiff's Original Video (subject | date | duration)	Infringing Video (channel | date | duration)	Extent of reproduction as pleaded
1.	**First Original Video** Exclusive interview of Ms. Saayoni Ghosh, Member of Parliament 01.07.2024 | 00:43	**First Infringing Video** RSY News UP | 17.08.2024 | 00:43 **Second Infringing Video** RSY News Delhi | 17.08.2024	Entire work reproduced in both videos.
2.	**Second Original Video** Live recording of Mr. Arvind Kejriwal's roadshow from Chandgiram Akhara to the residence of the Chief Minister of Delhi 13.09.2024 (subscriber-only syndicated feed; on YouTube from 02.11.2024) | 05:27	**Third Infringing Video** RSY News | 13.09.2024 | 01:04:06	3:24 to 4:00 of the original reproduced as-is at 45:40 to 46:16 (36 seconds).
3.	**Third Original Video** Interview of Mr. Ravneet Singh Bittu, Member of Rajya Sabha 15.09.2024 | 04:23	**Fourth Infringing Video** RSY News Bihar | 16.09.2024 | 04:15	0:01 to 4:12 reproduced at 0:04 to 4:15.
4.	**Fourth Original Video** Exclusive interview of Mr. Prashant Kishor ahead of the launch of the Jan Suraaj Party 30.09.2024 | 19:31	**Fifth Infringing Video** RSY News UP | 01.10.2024 | 20:23 **Sixth Infringing Video** RSY News UP | 01.10.2024 | 05:25	Fifth: 0:01 to 19:22 reproduced at 1:03 to 20:23. Sixth: 12:42 to 18:05 reproduced at 0:03 to 5:25.
5.	**Fifth Original Video** Interview of Mr. Nayab Singh Saini, Chief Minister of Haryana 09.10.2024 | 12:09	**Seventh Infringing Video** RSY News Bihar | 09.10.2024 | 10:50	0:49 to 11:56 reproduced at 0:03 to 10:49.
6.	**Sixth Original Video** Recording of Dr. S. Jaishankar, Minister of External Affairs, boarding the aircraft after the SCO Summit 16.10.2024 | 02:15	**Eighth Infringing Video** RSY News | 16.10.2024 | 02:07	0:00 to 2:04 reproduced at 0:03 to 2:07.
7.	**Seventh Original Video** Exclusive interview of Mr. Prashant Kishor on the liquor issue in Bihar in the wake of the hooch tragedy 17.10.2024 | 09:26	**Ninth Infringing Video** RSY News UP | 17.10.2024 | 09:58	0:00 to 9:17 reproduced at 0:42 to 9:58.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

S. No.	Plaintiff's Original Video (subject | date | duration)	Infringing Video (channel | date | duration)	Extent of reproduction as pleaded
8.	**Eighth Original Video** News report on the blast near CRPF Public School, Rohini, with reactions of parents 22.10.2024 | 03:19	**Tenth Infringing Video** RSY News UP | 23.10.2024 | 03:11	0:00 to 3:09 reproduced at 0:02 to 3:12.
9.	**Ninth Original Video** News report on Mr. Akhilesh Yadav's birthday posters, including an exclusive interview of Mr. Fakhrul Hassan Chand 23.10.2024 | 02:37	**Eleventh Infringing Video** RSY News Delhi | 23.10.2024 | 02:29	1:34 to 2:10 reproduced at 1:36 to 2:12 (36 seconds).
10.	**Tenth Original Video** Exclusive interview of Swami Jagadguru Rambhadracharya 27.10.2024 | 03:45	**Twelfth Infringing Video** RSY News Delhi | 27.10.2024 | 03:36	0:00 to 3:35 reproduced at 0:01 to 3:36.

8. The plaintiff has also placed on record screenshots comparing the frames of the original videos with those of the infringing videos. A perusal thereof, including Annexure A to the written note filed on behalf of the plaintiff, shows that the frames of the infringing videos retain the plaintiff's "ANI" logo on the microphones and on-screen graphics, with defendant no. 1's mark superimposed at the top of the frame; certain frames even carry the legend "Source: ANI".

9. It is the plaintiff's case that, owing to the routine reproduction of its works, it invoked the copyright protection mechanism of defendant no. 2 and issued copyright strikes against the infringing videos, whereupon defendant no. 2 removed them from defendant no. 1's channels. The plaintiff categorically avers that it has never granted any licence or authorisation to Swami Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. to use or sub-license any of its works. The plaintiff further avers that defendant no. 1 itself deleted the tenth infringing video on 28.10.2024 after issuing a counter-notification

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

claiming to hold the requisite licence.

10. The suit was first listed on 18.11.2024, when this Court issued summons and, having found a *prima facie* case in favour of the plaintiff, granted an *ex parte ad interim* injunction. Defendant No. 1 was restrained from posting, publishing, uploading, distributing, republishing on any platform, or using in any manner, the plaintiff's original videos or any copyrighted work or content of the plaintiff. Defendant No. 1 was directed to remove and take down the infringing videos or any other content infringing the copyrighted work of the plaintiff and defendant no. 2 was directed to take down, block and disable access to the infringing videos on the YouTube platform.

11. As recorded in the order dated 19.02.2025, defendant no. 1 was served on 02.12.2024. Despite service, defendant no. 1 neither entered appearance nor filed its written statement. Consequently, *vide* order dated 04.03.2025, the interim injunction was made absolute and defendant no. 1 was proceeded against *ex parte*.

12. Defendant No. 2 has filed its written statement. As noticed above, on 20.08.2026, the plaintiff gave up prayer (e) of the plaint. The plaintiff has thereafter pressed the present application for summary judgment.

13. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff, submits that the plaintiff is the first owner of copyright in the original videos under Section 17 of the Copyright Act, 1957 (**"Copyright Act"**), and holds the exclusive right to reproduce them and communicate them to the public under Section 14(d) thereof. It is contended that the infringing videos are *verbatim* reproductions of the original videos, in most instances of their entirety, published without licence, and that the use is not fair dealing since defendant

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

no. 1 neither reviews nor criticises the plaintiff's content. It is urged that the plea of a licence from Swami Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. is false, that defendant no. 1 has chosen not to defend the suit, and that the averments in the plaint thus stand unrebutted. It is, therefore, prayed that the suit be decreed.

14. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of defendant no. 2, submits that defendant no. 2 is an intermediary under Section 2(1)(w) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and has no role in the creation of the impugned content. It is stated that the twelve URLs have already been removed by the uploader. Learned counsel states that in terms of paragraph 6 of its written statement, defendant no. 2 would act upon an appropriate direction of this Court for removal of content at specified URLs, once the plaintiff's rights are adjudicated.

15. Order XIII-A of the CPC was introduced by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, with the object of enabling the disposal of commercial disputes in a time-bound manner, without the necessity of recording oral evidence in every case. Rule 3 thereof, which sets out the grounds for summary judgment, reads as under:

> *"3. Grounds for summary judgment.—The Court may give a summary judgment against a plaintiff or defendant on a claim if it considers that—*
>
> *(a) the plaintiff has no real prospect of succeeding on the claim or the defendant has no real prospect of successfully defending the claim, as the case may be; and*
>
> *(b) there is no other compelling reason why the claim should not be disposed of before recording of oral evidence."*

16. In so far as suits before the Intellectual Property Division of this Court are concerned, Rule 27 of the IPD Rules further provides as under:

> *"27. Summary Adjudication*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

In cases before the IPD, the Court may pass summary judgment, without the requirement of filing a specific application seeking summary judgment on principles akin to those contained in Order XIIIA, Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 as applicable to commercial suits under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015."

17. The contours of the expression "no real prospect" were examined by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Su-Kam Power Systems Ltd. v. Kunwer Sachdev,***[1] wherein, drawing upon the jurisprudence under Part 24 of the Civil Procedure Rules of England and Wales and the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in ***Hryniak v. Mauldin***, it was held as under:

"42. Consequently, the new Rule, applicable to commercial disputes, demonstrates that trial is no longer the default procedure/norm.

xxx xxx xxx

49. Consequently, this Court is of the view that when a summary judgment application allows the Court to find the necessary facts and resolve the dispute, proceeding to trial would generally not be proportionate, timely or cost effective. It bears reiteration that the standard for fairness is not whether the procedure is as exhaustive as a trial, but whether it gives the Court the confidence that it can find the necessary facts and apply the relevant legal principles so as to resolve the dispute as held in Robert Hryniak (supra).

xxx xxx xxx

52. Consequently, this Court is of the opinion that there will be 'no real prospect of successfully defending the claim' when the Court is able to reach a fair and just determination on the merits of the application for summary judgment. This will be the case when the process allows the court to make the necessary finding of fact, apply the law to the facts, and the same is a proportionate, more expeditious and less expensive means to achieve a fair and just result."

18. The Supreme Court has recently had occasion to consider the scheme of Order XIII-A of the CPC in ***Reliance Eminent Trading and Commercial Private Limited v. Delhi Development Authority,***[2] while setting aside an

[1]2019 SCC OnLine Del 10764.
[2]2026 INSC 436.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

order of this Court declining summary judgment. Referring, *inter alia*, to ***Bright Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. v. MJ Bizcraft LLP***[3] and ***Su-Kam*** (supra), the Supreme Court explained the standard of "real prospect" and laid down the following non-exhaustive guidelines:

> *"51. ...It postulates that the likelihood of success must be real and substantial, as opposed to being merely fanciful or speculative. In other words, the standard envisages a degree of certainty higher than that of a claim which is merely arguable. Accordingly, where the Court finds that a claim or defence is so weak that it prima-facie discloses no reasonable prospect of success, it is neither necessary nor desirable to subject the parties to the rigours of a full-fledged trial…*
>
> *xxx xxx xxx*
>
> *57. There is no gainsaying that the Court ought not to conduct a mini-trial in this regard, rather take the statements and facts on the face, until any contemporaneous document indicates otherwise. In doing so, the Court ought to not only take into account the evidence actually available on the record, but also the evidence that can be reasonably be expected to be available in the process of trial.*
>
> *xxx xxx xxx*
>
> *59. Therefore, while considering an application for summary judgment under Order XIII-A of the CPC, the following non-exhaustive guidelines have to be complied –*
>
> *(i) That the procedural mandate under Order XIII-A, CPC be strictly complied.*
>
> *(ii) The Court should consider, (a) Whether Plaintiff has no real prospect of succeeding on the claim or issue; or (b) Whether the defendant has no real prospect of successfully defending the claim or issue; and*
>
> *(iii) The Court should also consider whether there is no other reason why the case or issue(s) should be allowed to go to trial.*
>
> *(iv) While ascertaining above, the Court does not have to take everything on the face value, but it must also not conduct a mini trial at the same time.*
>
> *(v) That the Court has to differentiate between a cause of action/defence respectively, which is real as opposed to fanciful prospect.*
>
> *(vi) That the Court ought to grasp the nettle, when dealing with the*

[3] 2017 SCC OnLine Del 6394.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

summary judgment applications to decide short points of law and interpretations.

(vii) The Court must take into account not only the evidence before it but also the evidence that can reasonably be expected to be led/available at the trial.

(viii) That the Court's usage of power under Order XIII-A, CPC is exceptional as it cuts short the process of trial and ought to be exercised where oral evidence and full trial is not required.

(ix) In order to ascertain the need for full trial over summary judgment, the Court has to see whether, in the interest of justice, it is more suited to conduct trial to – (a) Weigh the evidence, (b) Evaluate the credibility of a deponents, (c) Draw reasonable inferences from the evidence."

19. The Supreme Court in ***Reliance Eminent*** (supra) has also underscored that the scheme of Order XIII-A of the CPC is adversarial and not inquisitorial, and that service upon the defendant is mandatory. In the present case, defendant no. 1 was duly served on 02.12.2024, as recorded in the order dated 19.02.2025, and has consciously chosen to stay away. In ***Applause Entertainment Private Limited v. www.9xmovies.com.tw,***[4] a coordinate Bench of this Court, while decreeing a copyright suit concerning the unauthorised online communication of a web series, held that where the defendants have been proceeded against *ex parte*, it is not necessary to issue fresh notice before deciding an application under Order XIII-A of the CPC:

"21. Since defendants no.3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12 and 13 have already been proceeded against ex parte and the contesting defendants no. 1, 2, and 14 to 19 are infringing websites/URLs that did not enter an appearance, I do not find it necessary to issue fresh notices before deciding the present application under Order XIII-A, CPC seeking summary judgment."

20. Defendant No. 1 was served on 02.12.2024, and the outer limit of one hundred twenty days for filing its written statement under the proviso to

[4] 2025:DHC:1994.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

Order VIII Rule 1 of the CPC, as applicable to commercial suits, expired on 01.04.2025. No written statement has been filed. Order VIII Rule 10 of the CPC, as applicable to commercial disputes, provides as under:

> *"10. Procedure when party fails to present written statement called for by Court.—Where any party from whom a written statement is required under rule 1 or rule 9 fails to present the same within the time permitted or fixed by the Court, as the case may be, the Court shall pronounce judgment against him, or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit and on the pronouncement of such judgment a decree shall be drawn up.*
>
> *Provided further that no Court shall make an order to extend the time provided under Rule 1 of this Order for filing of the written statement."*

21. Consequently, the averments in the duly verified plaint stand unrebutted, and since no affidavit of admission or denial has been filed, the documents on record are deemed to be admitted. In ***Associated Broadcasting Company Limited v. Google LLC,***[5] a case which, too, arose out of copyright strikes on YouTube, this Court held as under:

> *"7. ...Accordingly, all the averments made in the Plaint have to be taken to be admitted. Further, since no affidavit of Admission / Denial has been filed on behalf of the Defendant Nos. 2 to 5 in respect of the documents filed with the Plaint, in terms of Rule 3 of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018, the same are deemed to have been admitted."*

22. The absence of a defence, however, does not relieve this Court of the obligation to satisfy itself that the plaint, read with the documents on record, establishes the plaintiff's entitlement to the reliefs claimed. The claim is, therefore, examined on its merits.

23. Equally, the power under Rule 27 of the IPD Rules enables this Court to pass a summary judgment in a suit before the Intellectual Property Division even without a specific application. Here, a specific application has

[5] 2026:DHC:1833.

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

in fact been filed and has been pressed. The procedural requirements are, therefore, satisfied.

24. Examination on merits indicates that each of the original videos is a work of visual recording accompanied by sound and is, therefore, a "cinematograph film" within the meaning of Section 2(f) of the Copyright Act. Proviso (b) to Section 17 of the Copyright Act provides as under:

> *"(b) subject to the provisions of clause (a), in the case of a photograph taken, or a painting or portrait drawn, or an engraving or a cinematograph film made, for valuable consideration at the instance of any person, such person shall, in the absence of any agreement to the contrary, be the first owner of the copyright therein;"*

25. The plaint specifically avers, in respect of each original video, the name of the journalist or cameraperson who recorded it, and that it was recorded for valuable consideration, at the instance of the plaintiff and with the plaintiff's equipment. The plaintiff has also placed on record the Professional Services Agreement, Clause 11 whereof assigns the intellectual property in such works to the plaintiff. These averments stand unrebutted. The plaintiff is, therefore, the owner of copyright in the original videos, as recordings.

26. Section 14(d) of the Copyright Act confers upon the owner of copyright in a cinematograph film the exclusive right, *inter alia*, to make a copy of the film, including by storing it in any medium by electronic means, and to communicate the film to the public. Under Section 51(a)(i), copyright is infringed when any person, without a licence from the owner, does anything, the exclusive right to do which is conferred upon the owner.

27. The tabulation in paragraph 7 above shows that ten of the twelve infringing videos reproduce the corresponding original videos either in their

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

entirety or virtually so, and that the sixth infringing video reproduces a continuous block of more than five minutes of the fourth original video. By uploading these videos on its YouTube channels, defendant No. 1 has copied the plaintiff's cinematograph films and communicated them to the public, both being acts within the exclusive domain of the plaintiff.

28. The only justification ever put forward by defendant no. 1 is the purported licence from Swami Entertainment Pvt. Ltd., asserted in its counter-notifications on the YouTube platform. The existence of such a licence lay within the knowledge of defendant no. 1, which, despite service, has neither appeared before this Court nor produced the same, in the face of a specific denial by the plaintiff. Such a defence is fanciful and not real, within the meaning of paragraph 59(v) of ***Reliance Eminent*** (supra).

29. Nor can the use be regarded as fair dealing for the reporting of current events under Section 52(1)(a)(iii) of the Copyright Act. The wholesale reproduction of ten videos operates as a substitute for the plaintiff's works.

30. The third infringing video was published on 13.09.2024, the very day the second original video was made available only to the plaintiff's subscribers on its secure syndicated feed, and nearly two months before it was published on YouTube. Defendant No. 1 is admittedly not a subscriber. The segment used in the eleventh infringing video constitutes nearly a quarter of that video and, as specifically pleaded and now admitted, includes an exclusive interview and is qualitatively substantial. The use in neither case is trivial or incidental to any independent reporting.

31. The relevant facts, namely the dates, channels, durations and timestamps of the videos, the frame-wise comparison, and the strikes and counter-notifications, are all documentary and stand admitted. No question

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

arises which requires the weighing of evidence or the evaluation of the credibility of any witness. This Court is, therefore, of the view that defendant no. 1 has no real prospect of successfully defending the claim, and there is no compelling reason why the claim should not be disposed of before recording of oral evidence.

32. The plaintiff is, therefore, entitled to a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction against defendant no. 1 in terms of prayers (A) and (B). As regards prayer (C), the direction against defendant no. 2 is confined to the twelve specifically identified URLs, now adjudicated to be infringing, which is in consonance with the stand taken by defendant no. 2 itself. Prayer (D), seeking a direction to defendant no. 1 to publish a public acknowledgment, is not warranted, since the injunction and the directions for removal adequately protect the plaintiff's rights.

33. Accordingly, I.A. 8733/2026 is allowed, and the suit is decreed *ex parte* against defendant no. 1, and against defendant no. 2 to the extent indicated hereinbelow:-

(i) Defendant No. 1, its proprietors, partners, directors, officers, servants, agents and all persons acting for or on its behalf, are permanently restrained from reproducing, uploading, publishing, communicating to the public, distributing, republishing or otherwise exploiting, on YouTube or any other platform, the plaintiff's original videos or any other copyrighted work of the plaintiff, without the plaintiff's authorisation.

(ii) Defendant No. 1 is directed to remove and take down, from all platforms including its YouTube channels "RSY News", "RSY

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV

News UP", "RSY News Delhi" and "RSY News Bihar", the twelve infringing videos identified in the plaint, and any other content reproducing the plaintiff's copyrighted works, to the extent not already removed.

(iii) The directions issued against defendant no. 2 *vide* order dated 18.11.2024, for taking down, blocking and disabling access to the infringing videos, shall stand confirmed and made absolute. Defendant No. 2 shall ensure that the infringing videos available at the following URLs are, and remain, taken down, blocked and disabled.

(iv) Prayer (D), seeking a direction to defendant no. 1 to publicly acknowledge on YouTube and other social media platforms that it had illegally reproduced the plaintiff's original videos, and prayer (F) are declined. Prayer (E), seeking deletion of all YouTube channels of defendant no. 1 by defendant no. 2, stands given up by the plaintiff on 20.08.2026.

34. I.A. 45137/2024, in which the interim injunction was made absolute on 04.03.2025, stands merged with the present decree and is disposed of accordingly.

35. The suit, along with pending applications, if any, stands disposed of in the above terms.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 29, 2026
Nc/ NK

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:NEHA CHOPRA
Signing Date:06.10.2026
16:27:49

Signature Not Verified
Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV