



\$~23

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

+ **CS(COMM) 1184/2025**

**DAZN LIMITED & ANR.**

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Siddharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder  
Garg, Mr. Priyansh Kohli and Ms.  
Shudhata Sudhir, Advocates.

versus

**BUFFSTREAMZ.SHOP & ORS.**

.....Defendants

Through:

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA**

**ORDER**

%

**07.11.2025**

**I.A. No. 27602/2025(for exemption from giving written notice to the government authority)**

1. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiffs under Section 80 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”), seeking exemption from serving prior notice under Section 80 of the CPC to Defendant No. 20, i.e., Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Defendant No. 23, i.e., Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited, Defendant No. 28, i.e., Department of Telecommunications and Defendant No. 29, i.e., the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology.

2. For the reasons stated in the Application, the same is allowed.

3. The Application stands disposed of.

**I.A. No. 27604/2025(Exemption from pre-institution Mediation)**

4. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiffs seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation Mediation under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (“CC Act”).

CS(COMM) 1184/2025

Page 1 of 12



5. As the present matter contemplates urgent interim relief, in light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Krithi*, 2023 SCC OnLine SC 1382, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution Mediation is granted.

6. The Application stands disposed of.

**CS(COMM) 1184/2025**

7. Let the Plaint be registered as a Suit.

8. Issue Summons. Let the Summons be served to the Defendants through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fee.

9. The Summons shall state that the Written Statement(s) shall be filed by the Defendants within 30 days from the date of the receipt of Summons. Along with the Written Statement(s), the Defendants shall also file an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the documents of the Plaintiffs, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

10. Liberty is granted to the Plaintiffs to file Replication(s), if any, within 30 days from the receipt of the Written Statement(s). Along with the Replication(s) filed by the Plaintiffs, an Affidavit of Admission / Denial of the documents of Defendants be filed by the Plaintiffs, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

11. In case any Party is placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession, its details and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

12. If any of the Parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the prescribed timelines.

13. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 18.12.2025 for completion of service and pleadings.



**I.A. No. 27603/2025(Additional Documents)**

14. The present Application has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiffs under Order XI Rule 1(4) of the CPC as applicable to Commercial Suits under the CC Act, seeking leave to place on record additional documents.

15. The Plaintiffs are permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the CC Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

16. Accordingly, the Application stands disposed of.

**I.A. No. 27601/2025 (U/O XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of CPC)**

17. Issue Notice. Notice be served through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fees.

18. The Plaintiffs have filed the present Suit seeking a permanent injunction to restrain infringement of their broadcast reproduction rights by Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 and other unknown parties.

19. Defendant Nos. 13 to 18 are Domain Name Registrars (“DNRs”) arrayed for the purpose of blocking access to Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 and to disclose information such as Name, Address, Email address, Mobile Number, payment details etc. related to the Registrants of Defendant Nos. 1 to 12.

20. Defendant Nos. 19 to 27 are Internet Service Providers (“ISPs”). Defendant Nos. 28 and 29 are arrayed by the Plaintiffs to assist in enforcing / ensuring compliance with any order of injunction that may be granted during the course of proceedings.

21. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiffs made the following submissions:

21.1. The Plaintiffs have acquired exclusive global media rights,



comprising television rights to be exercised *via* broadcast delivery systems, digital rights to be exercised *via* digital delivery systems, including internet and mobile technology, and certain ancillary rights (“**Exclusive Rights**”) in respect of the event ‘Chris Eubank v Conor Benn II’ (“**Event**”) scheduled to take place on or around 15.11.2025 in the United Kingdom. In exercise of the Exclusive Rights granted by one Sela Company (“**Sela**”) which is the owner of the Exclusive Rights in the Event, the Plaintiffs have acquired the Exclusive Rights to be exercised *via* Plaintiff No. 2.

21.2. Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 primarily host and disseminate live sporting events without authorization from lawful rights holders (“**Impugned Services**”). The Plaintiffs’ rights in various other sporting events were infringed by Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 by streaming contemporaneously in India, the recently concluded event ‘Joseph Parker vs Fabio Wardley Fight Card’. The said event was exclusively licensed to the Plaintiffs. Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 are streaming DAZN streams by circumventing the Plaintiffs’ exclusive streaming mechanism. Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, have also made categories for different sports including boxing and have been using the Plaintiffs’ content, including the Plaintiffs’ exclusive content. The Plaintiffs apprehend similar unauthorized streaming of the Event and undercard bouts on 15.11.2025, which are exclusively licensed to the Plaintiffs, as per the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 31.10.2025 by Sela.



- 21.3. There are several other websites, similar to Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, which already exist, or are likely to be created. The identity, constitution, and other particulars of such unknown websites will become known only when such websites start communicating and making available the Plaintiffs' exclusively licensed broadcasts and related content unauthorizedly over the internet.
- 21.4. The Impugned Services offered by Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 are not geo-restricted and are freely accessible to users across India, including in Delhi. The Plaintiffs, as rightsholders and exclusive licensees of the 'original works' as well as 'broadcasts', enjoys protection under Section 37 of the Copyright Act, 1957 ("**Act**"). Therefore, the making available and / or communication to the public of the content in which the Plaintiffs have the Exclusive Rights, without the Plaintiffs' authorization, by Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 and or any other unknown websites would amount to a violation of the Plaintiffs' Exclusive Rights. The alleged reproduction / communication is contemporaneous and has a potential of eroding the Plaintiffs' market, a considerable compensation for which has been paid by the Plaintiffs. The balance of convenience is against Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, who do not have authorization with respect to the Exclusive Rights, including, *inter alia*, to host, stream, reproduce, distribute, make available to the public and / or communicate the content in which the Plaintiffs have the Exclusive Rights. If the illegal activities of



Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 are not restrained during the pendency of the present proceedings, the Plaintiffs shall suffer irreparable harm since Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 intend to continue to exploit, diminish and dilute the value of the Exclusive Rights.

21.5. In the past whenever such Impugned Services have been enjoined by the courts, while the initial injunction may be applicable to a few websites which are identified in the Plaint, during the course of the events itself a large number of websites are uncovered which continue to disseminate unlawfully the said sporting events. Therefore, a relief of real time live blocking of other uncovered rogue websites is necessitated in the present case as Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 may activate other domains / websites and URLs during the Event so as to continue the Impugned Services even if blocking orders are passed by this Court.

22. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Counsel for the Plaintiffs, the pleadings and the documents on record, a *prima facie* case has been made out by the Plaintiffs for the grant of an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction. The Event is broadcasted through the Plaintiffs' website and mobile application namely DAZN, which is accessible across a variety of digital devices including computers, smartphones, tablets, and other electronic gadgets. The Plaintiffs have secured the Exclusive Rights for various events, including, the Event as specified in the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 31.10.2025, through considerable financial investment.

23. The apprehension of the unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the Event on Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 shall pose a significant



threat to the Plaintiffs' revenue streams undermining the value of the considerable investment made by the Plaintiffs in acquiring the Exclusive Rights. Additionally, the broadcast content, including footage, commentary, and other composite elements, is fully safeguarded under the Act. Therefore, the unauthorized use of these elements shall also infringe upon the copyright protections accorded to the broadcast content under the Exclusive Rights.

24. The issue of rogue websites engaging in the piracy of copyrighted content presents a recurring threat and disseminating or communicating any portions of the Event, without proper authorization or licensing from the Plaintiffs, would violate the Plaintiffs' Exclusive Rights.

25. This Court in ***Universal City Studios LLC v. Dotmovies.baby***, 2023:DHC:5842, granted a 'Dynamic+' injunction granting protection to works generated during the course of the pendency of the suit as also future works that will be created in the future so that while the content is generated, the same is not infringed upon in violation of Section 37 of the Act, till the time courts come to the rescue of the right holder. A relevant portion thereof, is reproduced below:

*"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.*

XXXXX

*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/alpha numeric 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.”*

(Emphasis Supplied)

26. In view of the above, given the fact that the Plaintiffs’ Exclusive Rights, as acquired from Sela are in question, if an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted at this stage, irreparable harm would be caused to the Plaintiffs. The balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiffs. The need for immediate relief is particularly pressing in this case, considering the live broadcast of the Event. Any delay in blocking access to Defendant Nos. 1 to 12 or any other rogue websites providing the Impugned Services, could lead to financial losses for the Plaintiffs, and an irreparable breach of their Exclusive Rights. Therefore, swift action to prevent the alleged infringements is crucial in the present case.

27. Accordingly, Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, their owners, partners, officers and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under them are restrained from communicating, hosting, streaming, screening, disseminating or making available for viewing / downloading, without authorization, any part of the Event i.e., ‘Chris Eubank v Conor Benn II’ on any electronic or digital platform, in any manner whatsoever.

28. Defendant Nos. 13 to 18, their directors, partners, officers, affiliates, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under them are directed to block and suspend the following Domain Names of Defendant Nos. 1 to 12



immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiffs' Counsel as under:

| <b>Defendant No.</b> | <b>Website</b>        | <b>Defendant No.</b> | <b>Domain Name Registrar</b> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1.                   | buffstreamz.shop      | 13                   | GoDaddy.com, LLC             |
| 8.                   | dubznetwork.site      |                      |                              |
| 10.                  | rojadirect.site       |                      |                              |
| 2.                   | fbstreams.pm          | 14                   | Hosting Concepts B.V.        |
| 3.                   | olympicstreams.co     | 15                   | Tucows Domains Inc.          |
| 4.                   | soccer-1000.com       |                      |                              |
| 7.                   | totalsportek.army     |                      |                              |
| 9.                   | gamestrend.net        |                      |                              |
| 5.                   | steameasta.app        | 16                   | NameCheap, Inc.              |
| 6.                   | streamingmaster.space |                      |                              |
| 11.                  | pandastream.live      | 17                   | Name.com, Inc.               |
| 12.                  | pappahd.live          | 18                   | Dynadot Inc.                 |

29. Further, Defendant Nos. 13 to 18 shall file an Affidavit in a sealed cover / password protected document disclosing the complete details of Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, as available with Defendant Nos. 13 to 18, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details and KYC details, within four weeks.

30. Defendant Nos. 19 to 27, their directors, partners, proprietors, affiliates, and all others in capacity of principal or agent acting for and on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under them are also directed to block Defendant Nos. 1 to 12, immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiffs' Counsel.

31. Defendant Nos. 28 and 29 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs for blocking / removing access to the websites as specified in Paragraph No. 28 of this Order.



32. Prior to or during the currency of the Event, if any further websites are discovered, which are unauthorizedly streaming and communicating content over which the Plaintiffs have Exclusive Rights, the Plaintiffs are granted liberty to communicate the details of such websites to Defendant Nos. 13 to 29 for blocking the said websites on a real time basis without undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the Plaintiffs, Defendant Nos. 13 to 29 shall take steps to immediately block the said websites in question and Defendant Nos. 28 and 29 shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiffs communicating the details of the websites, which are illegally streaming the Event.

33. Such a relief is called for in the present matter as any delay in blocking the websites would, in fact, result in considerable pecuniary loss to the Plaintiffs and result in irreparable violation of the Exclusive Rights of the Plaintiffs.

34. The Plaintiffs shall continue to file affidavits providing the details of the newly discovered websites, their Domain Names, the DNRs and the URLs, which are communicated and blocked to ensure that the Court is fully informed of the websites in respect of which blocking orders are sought. The Plaintiffs shall also file appropriate applications for impleadment of the said websites and this Order shall be extended against the said newly added Defendants.

35. If any website, which is not primarily an infringing website, is blocked in pursuance of this Order, it is permitted to approach the Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to do any illegal dissemination of the content over which the Plaintiffs have Exclusive Rights and the Court



would consider modifying the injunction if the facts and circumstances, so warrant.

36. Let the Reply to the present Application be filed within four weeks after service of Notice. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

37. The compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the CPC be done within two weeks.

38. List before this Court on 02.03.2026.

**TEJAS KARIA, J**

**NOVEMBER 7, 2025/sms**