



\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 1152/2025**
DAZN LIMITED & ANR.Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Siddharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Mr. Priyansh Kohli & Ms. Ishi Singh, Advocates.

Versus

9GOALS.IO & ORS.Defendants
Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, Mr. Mayank Sansanwal & Mr. Om Ram, Advocates. For D-46&47.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **06.11.2025**

I.A. No.26658/2025 (Exemption from pre-institution Mediation)

1. 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”).
2. 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.
3. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. No. 26656/2025 (for exemption from giving written notice to the government authority)

4. The present Application has been filed under Section 80 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”) seeking exemption from issuing Notice to Defendant No. 38, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd, Defendant No. 41, Mahanagar



Telephone Nigam Ltd., Defendant No. 46, Department of Telecommunications (“DoT”), and Defendant No. 47, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (“MeITY”).

5. In view of the urgent relief and the nature of relief sought against Defendant Nos. 38, 41, 46 and 47 the Plaintiffs are exempted from effecting two months’ prior notice under Section 80 of the CPC upon Defendant Nos. 38, 41, 46 and 47.

6. The Application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 1152/2025

7. Let the Plaint be registered as a Suit.

8. Issue Summons.

9. The learned Counsel appearing for Defendant Nos. 46 and 47 accepts Summons. Let Summons be issued to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fee.

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

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



12. 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.

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

14. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 24.12.2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

I.A. No.26657/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

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

16. 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.

17. Accordingly, the Application stands disposed of.

I.A. No. 26655/2025 (U/O XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of CPC)

18. Issue Notice. The learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 46 and 47 accepts Notice.

19. Issue Notice to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes including through e-mail upon filing of the Process Fee.

20. The Plaintiffs have filed the present Suit seeking a permanent injunction to restrain infringement of their broadcast reproduction rights by Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 and other unknown parties.

21. Defendant Nos. 27 to 36 are Domain Name Registrars (“DNRs”) arrayed for the purpose of blocking access to Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 and to



disclose information such as Name, Address, Email address, Mobile Number, payment details etc. related to the Registrants of Defendant Nos. 1 to 26.

22. Defendant Nos. 37 to 45 are Internet Service Providers (“**ISPs**”), Defendant Nos. 46 and 47 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.

23. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiffs made the following submissions before this Court:

23.1 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 ongoing event ‘Serie A Championship’ (“**Event**”) commenced on 23.08.2025. In exercise of the Exclusive Rights in the Event granted by one Lega Calcio Serie A (“**LCA**”) which is the owner of the Exclusive Rights, the Plaintiffs have acquired the Exclusive Rights to be exercised *via* Plaintiff No. 2.

23.2 Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 primarily host and disseminate live sporting events without authorization from lawful rights holders (“**Impugned Services**”). The Event matches are exclusively licensed to the Plaintiffs and that the Plaintiffs have not authorised Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 to broadcast the Event matches on Defendant Nos. 1 to 26.

23.3 Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 are streaming the Plaintiffs’ DAZN streams by circumventing the Plaintiffs’ exclusive streaming



mechanism. Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 have also made categories for different sports including boxing and have been using the Plaintiffs' contents, including the Plaintiffs' prior events. The Plaintiffs apprehend similar unauthorized streaming of the pending Event matches, which are exclusively licensed to the Plaintiffs, as per the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 10.10.2025 by LCA.

- 23.4 There are several other websites, similar to Defendant Nos. 1 to 26, 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.
- 23.5 The offering of Impugned Services is not geo-restricted and freely accessible to users across India, including in Delhi. The Plaintiffs, as rightsholders and exclusive licensees of the 'original works' as well as 'broadcasts', enjoy 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 26 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 26, 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 26 are not restrained during the pendency of the present proceedings, the Plaintiffs shall suffer irreparable harm since Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 intend to continue to exploit, diminish and dilute the value of the Exclusive Rights.

23.6 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 26 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.

24. 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 10.10.2025, through considerable financial investment.

25. The apprehension of the unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the Event on Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

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)

28. In view of the above, given the fact that the Plaintiffs’ Exclusive Rights, as acquired from LCA are in question, if an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted at this stage, irreparable harm would be caused to the Plaintiffs. 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 26 or any other rogue websites providing the Impugned Services, could lead to financial losses for the Plaintiffs, and an irreparable breach of the Exclusive Rights. Therefore, swift action to prevent the alleged infringements is crucial in the present case.

29. Accordingly, Defendant Nos. 1 to 26, 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 them are restrained from hosting, streaming, broadcasting, rebroadcasting, retransmitting, exhibiting, making available for viewing / downloading, providing access to and / or communicating to the public, displaying, uploading, modifying, publishing, updating and / or sharing without authorization, any part of the Event i.e., ‘Serie A Championship’ in any manner whatsoever so as to infringe the Plaintiffs’ Exclusive Rights.

30. Defendant Nos. 27 to 36, their directors, partners, proprietors, officers, affiliates, servants, employees, and all others in capacity of principal or agent



acting for and, on their behalf, or anyone claiming through, by or under are directed to block and suspend the following Domain Names of Defendant Nos. 1 to 26 immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiffs' Counsel:

Defendant No.	Website	DNR
1	9goals.io	Defendant No. 27
2	tvonline123.com	
3	in.yalla-live.org	
4	yalla--shoot.live	
5	socceronline.me	Defendant No. 28
6	yalla-live.app	Defendant No. 29
7	pelotaalibre.com	
8	watch.streameast.soccer	
9	kevinsport.top	
10	totalsportek.army	
11	tvmoca.net	Defendant No. 30
12	kooora4life.com	
13	pirloTVlibre.com	
14	rakhoixv.cc	
15	fbstreams.pm	Defendant No. 31
16	en84.sportplus.live	Defendant No. 32
17	freestreams-live1.watch	Defendant No. 33
18	sportsdark.com	Defendant No. 34
19	yalla-kooora.live	Defendant No. 35
20	kooora365.io	
21	koooralive-tv.io	
22	pelotalibre-tv.futbol	
23	rojatvdirecta.ws	
24	yalla-lives.io	
25	yalla-shoot-8k.com	
26	atsport.tv	Defendant No. 36

31. Further, Defendant Nos. 27 to 36 shall file an Affidavit in a sealed cover / password protected document disclosing the complete details of Defendant



Nos. 1 to 26, as available with Defendant Nos. 27 to 36, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details and KYC details, within four weeks.

32. Defendant Nos. 37 to 45, their directors, partners, proprietors, officers, affiliates, servants, employees, 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 26, immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiffs' Counsel.

33. Defendant Nos. 46 and 47 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs for blocking / removing access to the websites as specified in Paragraph No. 30 of this Order.

34. 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. 27 to 45 for blocking the said websites on a real time basis without undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the Plaintiffs, Defendant Nos. 27 to 45 shall take steps to immediately block the said websites in question and Defendant Nos. 46 and 47 shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiffs communicating the details of the websites, which are illegally streaming the Event.

35. 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.



36. 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.

37. 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.

38. Let the Reply to the present Application be filed within four weeks after service of the Notice. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

39. The Plaintiffs are permitted to ensure compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of CPC within a period of two days and file the Compliance Affidavit within two weeks.

40. List before this Court on 27.02.2026.

TEJAS KARIA, J

NOVEMBER 6, 2025/‘gsr’