



\$~58

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

+ **CS(COMM) 443/2024**
UNISYS INFOSOLUTIONS PVT LTD & ANR.Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Nikhil Chawla and Ms. Mansha
Mehta, Advs.

versus

TRANSSNET MUSIC LIMITED & ORS.Defendants

Through: Mr. Gopal Jain, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Ankur Sangal, Ms. Sucheta Roy and
Ms. Priyanka Jaiswal, Advs. for D-1
Mr. Ashutosh Kumar, *Amicus Curiae*
with Ms. Radhika and Mr. Adithya B,
Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **09.09.2025**

I.A. 22190/2025 (on behalf of Defendant No.1 seeking exemption from filing notarized affidavits and apostilled affidavits)

1. This is an application filed by Defendant No. 1 seeking exemption from filing notarized affidavits and apostilled affidavits.
2. Issue notice.
3. Learned counsel for the non-applicants/Plaintiffs accepts notice.
4. He states that the Board Resolution authorizing the individual who has filed these affidavits has not been placed on record.

He states that three other Authorized Representatives have filed separate pleadings in this matter, and even their Board Resolutions are not on record.



5. In response, learned senior counsel for Defendant No.1 states that the notarized and apostilled affidavits will be filed within two (2) weeks.

He further states that the Board Resolution authorizing each of the Authorized Representatives, who have filed their affidavits in these pleadings, will also be placed on record within two (2) weeks.

6. In view of the submissions made by the learned senior counsel for Defendant No. 1, the application is allowed and the time for filing the notarized and apostilled affidavits is extended for a period of two (2) weeks.

7. The Defendant no. 1 will place on record the Board Resolution for each of its authorized representatives.

8. Accordingly, this application stands disposed of.

I.A. 22192/2025 (under Order XXXIX Rule 4 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 on behalf of Defendant No. 1 for vacation of the ex parte ad interim injunction order dated 27.05.2024)

9. This is an application filed by Defendant No. 1 seeking vacation of the interim injunction order dated 27.05.2024.

10. In the captioned application at paragraph '3(e)', it is averred that the Plaintiffs have not filed the complete list of songs for which they are claiming injunction in the present suit.

11. However, learned senior counsel for the applicant/Defendant No. 1 states that last evening the entire list of songs was e-mailed by the Plaintiffs to Defendant No. 1.

He states that Defendant No. 1 seeks time to verify the said list.

12. In this application, Defendant No. 1 has further stated that Defendant No. 1 is not aware of the documents that form the basis of the Plaintiffs' claims of ownership of the sound recordings.

13. Learned counsel for the Plaintiffs clarifies that the Plaintiffs maintain



a repository of more than 40,000 songs, and the documents placed on record are representative in nature. He states that the Plaintiffs hold assignment agreements/ownership rights in respect of each of these songs, in which they assert copyright claims.

He further states that, in case Defendant No. 1 seeks to satisfy itself with documents related to Plaintiffs' ownership, it may do so.

14. In the considered opinion of this Court, in case Defendant No. 1 has any doubts regarding the copyright claims made by the Plaintiffs in the 40,000 songs, it must first verify with the third-party user, Music Labels, or the distributor who has uploaded the song on its platform, with respect to the latter's copyright claims.

Thereafter, if any doubt still persists with respect to Plaintiff's claims, Defendant No. 1 may call upon the Plaintiffs to furnish proof of its copyright claims. It is directed that in case the Defendant calls upon the Plaintiffs to show documents which form the basis of its copyright claim vis-à-vis the song, the Plaintiffs shall offer inspection of those documents to Defendant No. 1.

15. It is, however, clarified that in view of the submissions of the Plaintiffs made before this Court on affidavit, a presumption lies in favour of the Plaintiffs; nonetheless, Defendant No. 1, if disputing the Plaintiff's assertions, shall be entitled to seek inspection of the Plaintiff's ownership documents. Defendant no. 1 in such a case will however be liable for disclosing the name of the entity who has a contra claim of copyright in the song against the Plaintiff's claims.

16. Subject to the aforesaid observation, Issue notice.

17. Learned counsel for the plaintiff accepts notice. Reply be filed within



three (3) weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks thereafter.

18. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **04.10.2025**, the date already fixed.

19. List before the Court on **30.10.2025**, the date already fixed.

I.A. 22193/2025 (application under Order XXXIX Rule 2A read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, on behalf of the Plaintiffs)

20. This is an application filed by the Plaintiffs under Order XXXIX Rule 2A CPC.

21. One of the violations enlisted in the captioned application is Defendant No. 1's non-compliance with the directions issued at paragraph '4' of the order dated 29.05.2025.

22. In response, learned senior counsel for the non-applicant/Defendant No. 1 states on instructions that Defendant No. 1 shall deposit the \$30,000 USD within two (2) weeks.

23. He states that the deposit is being made without prejudice to the rights and contentions of Defendant No. 1, as reserved by the Division Bench *vide* order dated 13.08.2025 in FAO (OS) (COMM) 126/2025.

24. Reply be filed within three (3) weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within three (3) weeks thereafter.

25. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **04.10.2025**, the date already fixed.

26. List before the Court on **30.10.2025**, the date already fixed.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/msh/aa