



2026:DHC:1971

\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 840/2023, I.A. 6629/2024**
SUPER CASSETTES INDUSTRIES PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Advocate, Mr.
Harsh Kaushik, Mr. Sanjeevi
Sheshadri, Mr. Darpan Sachdeva, Ms.
Srishti Mishra, Advocates.

versus

RELIANCE ENTERTAINMENT STUDIOS PRIVATE LIMITED

..... Defendant

Through: Mr. Saurabh Kirpal, Sr. Advocate,
Ms. Malvika Kapila, Ms. Tanwangi
Shukla, Ms. Adya Rajkotia,
Advocates for D-1.

Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Advocate, Mr.
Thomas George, Ms. Tanvi Sinha,
Mr. Devrat Joshi, Ms. Riya Kumar,
Mr. Sumer, Ms. Shreya Sethi,
Advocates for Los Gatos Productions
Services India LLP.

Ms. Srishti Kumar, Ms. Rimjhim
Tiwari, Advocates for Novi Digital
Private Limited (Non-Applicant in IA
23378/2023).

Ms. Diya Kapur, Mr. Raj Duggal, Mr.
Aditya Lodha, Mr. Raghav Kumar,
Advocates for Window Seats Films
LLP.

Ms. Sneha Jain, Mr. Angad Singh
Makkar and Mr. Manas Raghuvanshi,
Advocates for Amazon Seller
Services Private Limited (Non-
Applicant in IA 23378/2023).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA



2026:DHC:1971

ORDER
01.04.2024

%

I.A. 6607/2024 (seeking injunction restraining the Defendant from releasing future films along with supporting affidavit)

1. Arguments have been heard extensively. At the outset, Mr. Amit Sibal, Senior Counsel representing the Plaintiff, submits that for the moment, the Plaintiff is willing to confine the scope of reliefs in the instant application to a direction to the Defendant to deposit with the Court, the amount of approximately Rs. 42.16 crores received by them from Los Gatos Productions Services India LLP, for licensing the movie Amar Singh Chamkila over which, the Plaintiff has the right to enforce their lien.
2. Among the various objections raised, Mr. Saurabh Kirpal, Senior Counsel for Defendant, has contended that prayer for deposit is not a part of the prayer clause and pertinently, the Plaintiff must demonstrate their entitlement to seek such a relief under Order XXXVIII Rule 5 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. On this issue, Mr. Sibal points to the averments made in the application to argue that there are sufficient pleadings which justify the Plaintiff's request. Besides, he argues that there is no legal impediment for a party to seek a relief lesser than what has been prayed for in the pleading.
3. Be that as it may, the Court inquired from Mr. Kirpal as to whether Defendant would like to file an additional reply as regards the prayer for deposit. No answer was forthcoming till the time hearing was concluded. Nonetheless, since the hearing is being adjourned for further arguments, the Defendant is permitted to file an additional reply, if any, on or before the next date of hearing, with respect to the Plaintiff's request for deposit of the



2026:DHC:1971

amount, as noted above. A copy thereof shall also be e-mailed to the Court Master within the said timeline.

4. Re-notify for further submissions on 03rd April, 2024.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 1, 2024/ab