



\$~21

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

CNR No. DLHC010491892026

+ **CS(COMM) 1113/2026 & I.A. 28359/2026**

DAZN LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder Garg, Mr. Priyansh Kohli & Mr. Manish Singh, Advs.

Versus

STREMEO.RU & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, Mr. Kautilya Birat, Mr. Tushar Hazrait & Mr. Sanskar Gupta, Advs. for D-21&22.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **12.10.2026**

I.A. No. 28355/2026 (Exemption from pre-institution Mediation)

1. This is an Application filed by the Plaintiff 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. 28358/2026 (Extension of time to file Court Fees)

4. The present Application has been filed by the Plaintiff under Section 149 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“**CPC**”), seeking exemption from payment of Court Fees at the time of the filing of the Suit.

CS(COMM) 1113/2026

Page 1 of 13



5. Considering the submissions made in the present Application, time of two weeks is granted to deposit the Court Fees.

6. The Application stands disposed of.

I.A. No. 28356/2026 (for exemption from giving written notice to the government authority)

7. The present Application has been filed under Section 80 of the CPC seeking exemption from issuing Notice to Defendant No. 21, Department of Telecommunications (“DoT”), Defendant No. 22, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (“MeITY”), Defendant No. 24, Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd. and Defendant No. 26, Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd. (“MTNL”).

8. Since the learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 has entered appearance, the present Application *qua* Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 has become infructuous, however, the Plaintiff is exempted from effecting two months’ prior notice under Section 80 of the CPC upon Defendant Nos. 24 and 26.

9. The Application stands disposed of

CS(COMM) 1113/2026

10. Let the Plaint be registered as a Suit.

11. Issue Summons.

12. The learned Counsel appearing for Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 accepts Summons. Let Summons be issued to the remaining Defendants through all permissible modes upon filing of the Process Fee.

13. The Summons shall state that the Written Statement(s) shall be filed by the Defendants within four weeks from the date of the receipt of Summons. Along with the Written Statement(s), the Defendants shall also



file Affidavit(s) of Admission / Denial of the documents of the Plaintiff, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

14. Liberty is granted to the Plaintiff 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 Plaintiff, Affidavit(s) of Admission / Denial of the documents of Defendant(s) be filed by the Plaintiff, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

15. 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.

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

17. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 16.12.2026 for completion of service and pleadings.

I.A. No. 28357/2026 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)

18. The present Application has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiff 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.

19. 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.

20. Accordingly, the Application stands disposed of.

I.A. No. 28354/2026 (U/O XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of CPC)

21. Issue Notice. The learned Counsel for Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 accepts Notice.



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

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

24. Defendant Nos. 32 to 43 are Domain Name Registrars (“**DNRs**”) arrayed for the purpose of blocking access to Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 and to disclose information such as Name, Address, Email address, Mobile Number, payment details etc. related to the Registrants of Defendant Nos. 1 to 20.

25. Defendant Nos. 23 to 31 are Internet Service Providers (“**ISPs**”), Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 are arrayed by the Plaintiff to assist in enforcing / ensuring compliance with any order of injunction that may be granted during the course of proceedings.

26. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff made the following submissions before this Court:

26.1 The Plaintiff has 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 (“**Licensed Rights**”) in respect of the ongoing event ‘Serie A Football Season 2026-27’ (“**Event**”) commenced on 21.08.2026. In exercise of the Licensed Rights in the Event granted by one Lega Calcio Serie A / Defendant No. 44 (“**LCA**”) which is the owner of the Licensed Rights, the Plaintiff has acquired the Licensed Rights.



- 26.2 Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 primarily host and disseminate live sporting events without authorization from lawful rights holders (“**Impugned Services**”). The Event matches are exclusively licensed to the Plaintiff and that the Plaintiff has not authorised Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 to broadcast the Event matches on Defendant Nos. 1 to 20.
- 26.3 Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 are streaming the Plaintiff’s DAZN streams by circumventing the Plaintiff’s exclusive streaming mechanism. Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 have also made categories for different sports including boxing and have been using the Plaintiff’s contents, including the Plaintiff’s prior events. The Plaintiff apprehends similar unauthorized streaming of the pending Event matches, which are exclusively licensed to the Plaintiff, as per the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 21.08.2026 by LCA.
- 26.4 There are several other websites, similar to Defendant Nos. 1 to 20, 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 Plaintiff’s exclusively licensed broadcasts and related content unauthorizedly over the internet.
- 26.5 The offering of Impugned Services is not geo-restricted and freely accessible to users across India, including in Delhi. The Plaintiff, 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 Plaintiff has the Licensed Rights, without the Plaintiff’s authorization by Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 and / or any other unknown websites would amount to a violation of the Plaintiff’s Licensed Rights. The alleged reproduction / communication is contemporaneous and has a potential of eroding the Plaintiff’s market, a considerable compensation for which has been paid by the Plaintiff. The balance of convenience is against Defendant Nos. 1 to 20, who do not have authorization with respect to the Licensed Rights, including, *inter alia*, to host, stream, reproduce, distribute, make available to the public and / or communicate the content in which the Plaintiff has the Licensed Rights. If the illegal activities of Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 are not restrained during the pendency of the present proceedings, the Plaintiff shall suffer irreparable harm since Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 intend to continue to exploit, diminish and dilute the value of the Licensed Rights.

26.6 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 20 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.

27. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff, the pleadings and the documents on record, a *prima facie* case has been made out by the Plaintiff for the grant of an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction. The Event is broadcasted through the Plaintiff's website and mobile application namely DAZN, which is accessible across a variety of digital devices including computers, smartphones, tablets, and other electronic gadgets. The Plaintiff has secured the Licensed Rights for various events, including, the Event as specified in the Rights Confirmation Letter dated 21.08.2026, through considerable financial investment.

28. The apprehension of the unauthorized dissemination, telecasting, or broadcasting of the remaining matches of the Event on Defendant Nos. 1 to 20 shall pose a significant threat to the Plaintiffs' revenue streams undermining the value of the considerable investment made by the Plaintiff in acquiring the Licensed 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 Licensed Rights.

29. 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 Plaintiff, would violate the Plaintiff's Licensed Rights.



30. 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)

31. In view of the above, given the fact that the Plaintiff’s Licensed 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 Plaintiff. Balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiff. 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 20 or any other rogue websites providing the Impugned Services, could lead to financial losses for the Plaintiff, and an irreparable breach of



the Licensed Rights. Therefore, swift action to prevent the alleged infringements is crucial in the present case.

32. Accordingly, Defendant Nos. 1 to 20, 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 Football Season 2026-27’ in any manner whatsoever so as to infringe the Plaintiff’s Licensed Rights.

33. Defendant Nos. 32 to 43, 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 20 immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiff’s Counsel:

Defendant No.	Website	Defendant No.	Domain Name Registrar
1.	stremeo.ru	32.	REGTIME-RU
2.	mutstreams.ch	33.	NETIM
3.	streamed.pk	34.	PKNIC
4.	streamonsport.lat	35.	NameSilo, LLC
5.	livelive24.com	36.	NICENIC



			INTERNATIONAL GROUP CO., LIMITED
6.	vipbox.lc	37.	Key-Systems GmbH
8.	sportika.net	38.	Tucows Domains Inc.
11.	tvapp1.com		
14.	primeshows.org		
16.	buffstreams24.com		
9.	soccerbox.me	39.	TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd.
12.	vipleague.me		
15.	buffsports.io		
18.	mainsports.me		
10.	tarjetaroja.cloud	40.	Dynadot, LLC
13.	soccerworldcup.me	41.	eNom, LLC
17.	streamed.st	42.	IncogNET
19.	streameast.llc	43.	NameCheap, Inc.
20.	footem.fit		
7.	strikeout.im	-	-

34. Further, Defendant Nos. 32 to 43 shall file an Affidavit in a sealed cover / password protected document disclosing the complete details of Defendant Nos. 1 to 20, as available with Defendant Nos. 32 to 43, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details and KYC details, within four weeks.

35. Defendant Nos. 23 to 31, 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 20, immediately upon service of copy of this Order by the Plaintiffs' Counsel.

36. Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs for blocking / removing access to the websites as specified in Paragraph No. 33 of this Order.

37. 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 Plaintiff has Licensed Rights, the Plaintiff is granted liberty to communicate the details of such websites to Defendant Nos. 23 to 43 for blocking the said websites on a real time basis without undue delay. Upon receiving the said intimation from the Plaintiff, Defendant Nos. 23 to 43 shall take steps to immediately block the said websites in question and Defendant Nos. 21 and 22 shall also issue necessary blocking orders immediately upon the Plaintiffs communicating the details of the websites, which are illegally streaming the Event.

38. 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 Plaintiff and result in irreparable violation of the Licensed Rights of the Plaintiff.

39. The Plaintiff 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 Plaintiff shall also file appropriate applications for implementation of the said



websites and this Order shall be extended against the said newly added Defendants.

40. 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 Plaintiff has Licensed Rights and the Court would consider modifying the injunction if the facts and circumstances, so warrant.

41. 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.

42. The Plaintiff is 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.

43. List before this Court on 25.01.2027.

TEJAS KARIA, J

OCTOBER 12, 2026

‘gsr’