



\$~39

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ CS(COMM) 1194/2025 & I.A. 27751/2025 I.A. 27752/2025 I.A.  
27753/2025 I.A. 27754/2025 I.A. 27755/2025 I.A. 27756/2025 I.A.  
27757/2025 I.A. 27758/2025

JAYA BACHCHAN

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Sr. Adv., Mr.  
Pravin Anand, Mr. Avneet Naik, Mr.  
Dhruv Anand, Ms. Udit Patro, Ms.  
Nimrat Singh, Mr. Dhananjay  
Khanna, Mr. Aman Saraf, Ms. Shreya  
Sethi, Ms. Riya Kumar, Advocates

versus

BOLLYWOOD BUBBLE TELEVISION & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Vivek Ayyagiri and Manas  
Raghuvanshi, Advocates for  
Defendant No. 4

Mr. Nitin Sharma, Mr. Angad S.  
Makkar, Mr. Naman Tandon,  
Advocates for D-5

Mr. Varun Pathak, Advocate for D-6

Ms. Mamta Jha, Ms. Shruttima  
Ehersa, Ms. Aiswarya Debadarshini,  
Advocates for D-8

Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC, Mr. Om  
Ram, Advocate for D-9 and D-10

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA**

**ORDER**

%

**10.11.2025**



**I.A. 27758/2025(seeking exemption from giving written notice to the Government Authorities)**

1. This is an application under Section 80(2) read with Section 151 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 ['CPC'], seeking exemption from giving written notice to the Government Authorities i.e., Defendant Nos. 9 and 10.
2. Ms. Nidhi Raman, learned CGSC has entered appearance on behalf of Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 and accepts notice. She states that she has no objection to the exemption being granted in view of the fact that the said Defendants are proforma parties.
3. In view of the aforesaid, the exemption is granted and the application is disposed of.

**I.A. 27757/2025(seeking time to file certificate under Section 63(4)(c) BSA)**

4. This is an application under Section 151 CPC, seeking time for filing the required certificate under 63(4)(c) of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam, 2023.
5. In view of the averments made in application, the Plaintiff is directed to file the certificate within a period of within four (4) weeks.
6. With the aforesaid directions, the application is disposed of.

**I.A. 27756/2025(seeking exemption for instituting pre-litigation mediation)**

7. This is an application under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 read with Section 151 CPC, seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation mediation.
8. Having regard to the facts that the present suit contemplates urgent interim relief and in light of the judgement of the Supreme Court in **Yamini**



**Manohar v. T.K.D. Keerthi**<sup>1</sup>, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution mediation is granted to the Plaintiff.

9. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

**I.A. 27755/2025(seeking extension of time to file court fee)**

10. This is an application under Section 149 CPC read with Section 151 CPC, seeking extension of time to file court fee.

11. The application is allowed subject to the Court fee Certificate being deposited within a period of one (1) week, failing which the plaint shall be rejected under Order VII Rule 11(b) CPC.

12. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

**I.A. 27754/2025(seeking exemption from filing clearer copies)**

13. This is an application under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing clearer copies of documents and translated copies of vernacular language documents.

14. Subject to the Plaintiff filing the typed copies of dim/illegible documents, within four (4) weeks from today, exemption is granted for the same.

15. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

**I.A. 27753/2025(seeking leave to file additional documents)**

16. This is an application under Order XI Rule 1(4) of the CPC [as amended by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015] seeking leave to file additional documents, within thirty (30) days.

17. The Plaintiff, if it wishes to file additional documents, shall file it within 30 days, and it shall do so strictly as per the provisions of the Commercial Courts Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules,

---

<sup>1</sup> (2024) 5 SCC 815



2018 [‘DHC Rules’].

18. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed.

19. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

**I.A. 27752/2025(seeking discovery, production, and inspection)**

20. This is an application under Order XI Rule 1, 3 and 5 CPC [as amended by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015] read with section 151 CPC seeking discovery, production, and inspection of the Defendants’ documents mentioned at paragraph no. 3 of the captioned application.

21. Issue notice to Defendant Nos. 1, 2 and 7.

22. Reply be filed within four (4) weeks from receipt of notice.

23. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.

24. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **22.12.2025**.

25. List before Court on **16.04.2026**.

**CS(COMM) 1194/2025**

26. The present suit has been filed seeking permanent injunction restraining the Defendants from misappropriation of personality rights, publicity rights, infringement of copyright, performer’s rights and passing off, along with other ancillary relief.

27. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

28. Issue summons.

29. Summons be issued to Defendant Nos. 1, 2 and 7 [‘infringing Defendants’] only, by all permissible modes on filing of process fee. An affidavit of service be filed within two (2) weeks.

30. The summons shall indicate that the written statement(s) must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of the summons. The Defendants shall also file affidavit(s) of admission/denial of the documents



filed by the Plaintiff, failing which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

31. The Plaintiff is at liberty to file replication thereto within thirty (30) days after filing of the written statement(s). The replication shall be accompanied by affidavit of admission/denial in respect of the documents filed by Defendants, failing which the replication shall not be taken on record.

32. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.

33. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

34. Mr. Vivek Ayyagiri, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 4; Mr. Angad S. Makkar, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 5; Mr. Varun Pathak, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 6; Ms. Mamta Jha, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 8 and Ms. Nidhi Raman, learned CGSC, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant nos. 9 & 10, have entered appearances on advance notice.

Defendant Nos. 3 to 6 and 8 to 10 have been impleaded as 'Proforma Defendants' in the suit for ensuring compliance of the directions. Since they are Proforma Defendants, no summons is being issued to the said Defendants. The said Defendants therefore, do not have to file written statement. Directions for compliance have been issued qua said Proforma Defendants in I.A. 27751/2025.

35. Defendant No. 11 is an unknown entity-John Doe, as Plaintiff has sought relief against unknown entities. After Plaintiff has received Basic Subscriber Information ['BSI'] details from the proforma Defendants with



respect to the unknown entities, it shall file an amended memo of parties within two (2) weeks from receipt of an information and thereafter summons will be issued to the said identified entities.

36. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff states that he will within two (2) weeks file an amended memo of partes impleading the websites/domain names and their corresponding DNRs, enlisted at Document 4 annexed with the plaint, as parties.

37. Upon the amended memo of parties being filed, learned Joint Registrar (J) is requested to issue summons to the said websites/domain names and their corresponding DNRs.

38. There are clerical errors in the plaint as well as in I.A. 27751/2025, the Plaintiff is granted liberty to file an amended plaint and I.A. 27751/2025 carrying out correction within two (2) days.

39. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **22.12.2025**.

40. List before Court on **16.04.2026**.

**I.A. 27751/2025(under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 CPC)**

41. This is an application filed under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 CPC seeking an ex-parte ad-interim injunction against the Defendants.

42. Mr. Sandeep Sethi, learned senior counsel appearing for the Plaintiff has referred to the contents of the plaint and sets up the Plaintiff's case as under:

42.1 The Plaintiff, Jaya Bachchan, is regarded as one of the renowned actresses of Hindi cinema, with a career spanning over six decades. During 1970s, she emerged as one of the highest paid actresses of the era. Recently her film *Rocky Aur Rani kii Prem Kahaani (2023)* emerged as one of the highest-grossing Hindi film of the year. A list highlighting some of the very



famous and highest-grossing Hindi films of the Plaintiff is attached as document no. 1, filed along with the plaint.

42.2 The Plaintiff has been a recipient of numerous accolades and honours. She has won ten (10) Filmfare Awards including a Lifetime achievement Award. In the 70<sup>th</sup> Filmfare Awards she was celebrated with the Filmfare Cinema Icon Awards. The Government of India recognized her contribution to Indian cinema by awarding her with Padma Shri, India's fourth-highest civilian honour, in 1992. A comprehensive list of awards and achievements of the Plaintiff is attached as document no. 2, filed along with the plaint.

42.3 The Plaintiff has also built a significant political career which began in 2004 as the Member of Parliament from the Samajwadi Party. She has been elected five times as a Rajya Sabha MP and continues her fifth term from 2024 to present. Since September 2021 she has been a Member of the Committee of External Affairs. Thus, Plaintiff has achieved widespread recognition across the country and is noted not only for her work in cinema but also for her contribution by ways of public service.

42.4 It is stated that the Plaintiff's personal name 'Jaya Bachchan' is peculiar in nature and has attained a distinctive indicium of its own being exclusively associated with the Plaintiff. The Plaintiff has been a brand ambassador for several brands including famous jewellery brands like Kalyan Jewellers and Tanishq and has also taken part in campaigns for public health on television. The Plaintiff's on-screen appearances and commercial endorsements are done through the utilization of attributes of her personality/persona as her name, likeness, signature, voice, image and other characteristics that are uniquely identifiable and associated with the Plaintiff and no one can utilize and/or misappropriate and/or imitate any



facet of the Plaintiff's personality and/or exploit the same commercially in any manner whatsoever without the consent and/or express authorization of the Plaintiff.

**Misuse by the Defendants**

42.5 The Defendants are a range of e-commerce websites and digital entities engaged in unauthorized use of the Plaintiff's name, likeness, signature, voice and image.

42.6 Defendant no. 1 is an entity that owns and operates a website as well as a Facebook account that is disseminating AI-generated content utilizing the Plaintiff's personal attributes for selling merchandise.

42.7 Defendant no. 2 is an online marketplace selling various infringing articles such as t-shirts, stickers, mugs, posters using the Plaintiff's personal attributes.

42.8 Defendant no. 3, 4 and 5 are e-commerce websites which offer a platform for sale of various impugned articles infringing Plaintiff's personality rights. The details of the URLs/links on these websites are enlisted at Document 1 annexed with the plaint.

42.9 Defendant no. 6/Meta runs and operates social media platform Instagram and Facebook, and Defendant no. 8/Google LLC owns and operates social media platform YouTube. These defendants have been impleaded as proforma defendants to facilitate compliance of directions sought for take down of URLs/links enlisted in Document 2 and Document 3 respectively, annexed with the plaint.

The take down is sought for a specific account on Instagram which has created morphed videos using AI which are inappropriate and vulgar as well as another Instagram account, which impersonates the Plaintiff.



The Plaintiff seeks take down of a specific YouTube channel impleaded as Defendant No. 7 on the plea that this channel has uploaded videos which are egregious and they portray the Plaintiff in a false setting with other celebrities. It is stated that these videos are inappropriate and vulgar. It is stated that Plaintiff has identified inappropriate content similar to the content uploaded on the YouTube channel/Defendant No. 7 and it seeks take down of this similar content enlisted in Document 3 annexed with the plaint, from the social media platform of YouTube.

42.10 It is stated that Plaintiff has also learnt about utilisation of her name by various entities to host pornographic stories and videos on their websites. The list of the websites hosting such content has been enlisted at Document 4 annexed with the plaint, and directions are prayed to Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 [MeiTj and DoT] to block these websites.

42.11 Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 [MeiTj and DoT] along with Defendant Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 have been arrayed as Proforma parties for enforcement purposes.

42.12 Defendant No. 11 represents unknown (John Doe/Ashok Kumar) entities engaged in the infringing acts identified on the platforms of the proforma Defendants and the websites enlisted in Document 4 annexed with the plaint.

43. Mr. Sandeep Sethi, learned senior counsel for the Plaintiff submits that the Plaintiff has been an immensely popular actress and a recognised personality worldwide with enormous fan following. He states that her image, photograph and likeness as a result bring about an instinctive association in the mind of the public with her and no one else.

43.1 He states that on the Instagram platform of Defendant No. 6 there



have been instances where the Plaintiff's name and images are being used to show the public that certain Instagram pages are run by her officially, however, the same is operated without her authorization.

43.2 He states that there are dishonest traders who physically affix the Plaintiff's image on various products with the aim to unlawfully show nexus/affiliation/sponsorship/association with the Plaintiff, so as to boost their illegal profits.

43.3 He states that majority of infringers/Defendants are using technology to morph the Plaintiff's face onto videos and superimpose the Plaintiff's face on the bodies of other people and Artificial Intelligence technology to create false and misleading images and/or videos of the Plaintiff along with other celebrities, in some instances providing inappropriate and incorrect information.

43.4 He states that the Plaintiff's name and image/visuals have been found to be utilized by various parties to post/host pornographic content on their websites/social media pages, by portraying the Plaintiff in an obscene setting which is prejudicial to her honour and reputation and subject the Plaintiff and her family to humiliation for the sake of distasteful humour.

43.5 He states that therefore, the Plaintiff seeks an ex parte ad-interim injunction to protect and preserve her personality as well as publicity rights, rights under the Copyright Act, 1957 and common law rights which are summarized at paragraph 29 of the plaint.

43.6 He seeks directions for take down against Defendant Nos. 2 to 5 with respect to URLs/links enlisted in Document 1 annexed with the plaint; seeks directions to Defendant No. 6 to take down the URLs/links enlisted in Document 2 annexed with the plaint, directions to Defendant No. 8 to take



down the URLs/links in Document 3 annexed with the plaint and directions to Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 to take steps for issuing blocking orders to ISPs for the domain names enlisted at Document 4 annexed with the plaint.

**Finding and Directions**

44. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

45. Mr. Vivek Ayyagiri, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 4; Mr. Angad S. Makkar, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 5; Mr. Varun Pathak, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 6; Ms. Mamta Jha, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 8 and Ms. Nidhi Raman, learned CGSC on behalf of Defendant nos. 9 and 10, have entered appearances on advance notice.

46. Learned counsel for Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 states that the information provided in Document 4 annexed with the plaint are infringing URLs, however, Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 will not be able to issue blocking order with respect to the URLs and it can only issue blocking orders with respect to the domain name mentioned in the said URLs.

47. In this suit, the Plaintiff has joined its causes of action against the Defendants and has filed the suit on the following causes which can be summarised as under:

- i. impersonating the Plaintiff on social media platforms such as Instagram by creating fake accounts using her name and images;
- ii. selling unauthorized merchandise bearing the Plaintiff's name, image and likeness on various e-commerce platforms including coffee mugs, T-shirts, posters, phone cases, and other products;
- iii. creating and disseminating AI-generated content that misrepresents



facts to the public and falsely depicts the Plaintiff in inappropriate scenarios;

- iv. using artificial intelligence and deepfake technology to morph and superimpose the Plaintiff's face to create distasteful, sexually explicit; and
- v. disseminating pornographic videos and images of the Plaintiff.

48. The Plaintiff asserts that the infringing Defendants and unknown entities/John Doe's actions violate (i) her personality rights which includes her name, signature, voice, image, likeness and other distinctive elements uniquely associated with her; (ii) her performer's rights and moral rights under the Copyright Act, 1957; (iii) common law rights; and (iv) more specifically, the Plaintiff asserts violation of her fundamental right to privacy as well as goodwill and reputation.

49. On the basis of the assertions made in the plaint and perusal of documents filed on record, this Court is of the prima facie view that the Plaintiff is undoubtedly a renowned actress, who has established goodwill and reputation in the realm of Indian as well as global cinema. Even as a public figure, through public service and philanthropy she has assimilated respect with her constituency and admiration within the film industry and the audience.

50. In the view of the law settled in **D.M. Entertainment Vs. Baby Gift House<sup>2</sup>**, **Anil Kapoor Vs. Simply Life India & Ors.<sup>3</sup>**, and **Jaikishan Kaku Bhai Sarf Alias Jackie Shroff Vs. The Peppy store and Ors.<sup>4</sup>** there can be

---

<sup>2</sup> MANU/DE/2043/2010

<sup>3</sup> 2023 SCC Online Del 6914[Paragraph Nos. 38 to 40]

<sup>4</sup> 2024 SCC Online Del 3664.



no dispute that this status inherently grants the Plaintiff proprietary rights over her personality and associated attributes.

51. Therefore, prima facie, the Plaintiff's personality traits and/or parts thereof, including the Plaintiff's name Jaya Bachchan as well as Jaya Amitabh Bachchan, likeness, signature, voice, image and other aspects of her persona are protectable elements of the Plaintiff's personality rights. The Plaintiff is entitled to seek injunction against the use of her personality rights by third-parties for their commercial gains without her authorisation. In addition, the Plaintiff is also entitled to protect herself against morphed and distorted content which is defaming and demeaning to herself and her family.

52. This Court has perused the documents filed on record pertaining to Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 as well as the merchandise being offered on the platform of Defendant Nos. 3 and 5. The documents show that these Defendants and the re-sellers on the e-platform of Defendant Nos. 3 and 5 are selling merchandise which utilises the Plaintiff's personality rights. Since, the Plaintiff has asserted that she has not authorised the use of her personality rights by the said sellers, the Plaintiff has made out a case for issuance of directions for take down of the said URLs/links as enlisted in Document 1 annexed with the plaint. The Plaintiff has the exclusive rights to exploit her publicity rights.

53. This Court has also perused the impugned images uploaded on the specific Instagram account as filed with the plaint. The contention of the Plaintiff that the said images created by AI generated content misrepresent facts to the public and falsely depicts the Plaintiff in inappropriate scenarios is prima facie made out. The Plaintiff has also objected to another Instagram



account which misrepresents itself to be her personal account. In the considered opinion of this Court, the prayer of the Plaintiff for seeking take-down of the URLs and the specific account impersonating her as enlisted in Document 2 annexed with the plaint is also prima facie made out.

54. The Plaintiff has objected to the videos posted on the YouTube channel impleaded as Defendant No. 7 wherein similarly Plaintiff's likeness has been created by AI technology to falsely depict her in inappropriate scenarios which are distasteful in her opinion. Having perused the screenshots placed on record, in the considered opinion of this Court, the prayer for take-down of the said infringing videos and identical content uploaded on YouTube as enlisted in Document 3 annexed with the plaint is prima facie made out.

55. The Plaintiff has also prayed for blocking of pornographic videos available on the URLs of the websites enlisted in Document 4 annexed with the plaint. It is stated that the said videos have not been downloaded and filed with the plaint in view of its explicit content and the Plaintiff has stated that the Court may rely upon the affidavit filed in support of the plaint to issue directions for the blocking orders to Defendant Nos. 9 and 10. Keeping in view the averments made in the plaint at paragraph 77 which is duly supported with an affidavit, this Court is satisfied that the Plaintiff has made out a case for issuance of blocking orders for websites/domain names enlisted in Document 4 annexed with the plaint.

56. In view of the above, the Plaintiff has established a prima facie case for grant of an ex-parte ad interim injunction. The balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiff and against the Defendants. This Court is of the prima facie opinion that if an injunction is not granted in favour of the



Plaintiff, irreparable loss and harm would be caused to the Plaintiff's reputation.

57. This Court has perused the document no. 7 filed along with the paper-book, claiming the movie poster available on Defendant No. 4/Amazon's e-commerce website infringes Plaintiff's personality rights. However, prima facie this Court does not find that the said movie poster violates the Plaintiff's publicity rights and therefore, no case for issuing directions is made out against the reseller of the said products at this ex-parte stage. This issue will be considered after the said party has been impleaded and is heard.

58. Accordingly, until the next date of hearing following directions are hereby issued: -

- a) Defendant Nos. 1, 2, 7 and 11, their principal officers, servants, agents, affiliates, subsidiaries, distributors and all others acting for and on their behalf **are restrained from** violating the Plaintiff's Personality Rights by utilizing and/or in any manner directly and/or indirectly, using or exploiting or misappropriating the Plaintiff's (a) name 'Jaya Bachchan' 'Jaya Amitabh Bachchan'; (b) image and likeness; (c) voice; (d) signature and (e) any other attributes of her persona which are exclusively identifiable with her for any commercial and/or personal gain and/or otherwise by exploiting them in any manner whatsoever without the Plaintiff's consent and/or authorization, through the use of any technology including but not limited to Artificial Intelligence, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, Deepfakes, Face Morphing, and on any mediums and formats whether for monetary gains or otherwise to create any videos, photographs etc. so as to



result in violation of the Plaintiff's rights.

- b) Defendant No. 1 is directed to take down all the infringing posts filed at page nos. 55 to 57 of the documents filed along with the plaint, within one (1) week.
- c) Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 5 are restrained from selling and/or facilitating sale of merchandise which infringes the personality rights of the Plaintiff. The said Defendants are directed to delist the products, which are solicited on their website, and are enlisted as Document 1 annexed with the plaint, within one (1) week.
- d) Defendant No. 6 is directed to take down all the infringing URLs, enlisted as Document 2 annexed with the plaint, within one (1) week.
- e) Defendant No. 7 is directed to take down all the infringing content, mentioned at page nos. 217 to 226 of the documents filed along with the plaint, within one (1) week.
- f) Defendant No. 8 is directed to take down all the infringing content, enlisted as Document 3 annexed with the plaint, within one (1) week. It is further directed to provide the Basic Subscriber Information ['BSI'] details with respect to the YouTube Channels enlisted at Document 3 annexed with the plaint.
- g) Defendant Nos. 9 and 10 are directed to issue appropriate orders to ISPs for blocking of the websites/domains enlisted in Document 4, annexed with the plaint, within one (1) week.
- h) Defendant No. 4 is directed to provide the BSI details of the reseller, whose products are enlisted in document no. 7 filed with the plaint, within one (1) week.



59. The Plaintiff will be at liberty to approach Defendant Nos. 6 and 8 through counsels who have entered appearance for taking down any mirror or identical content more specifically enlisted at paragraph 47(iii) and (iv) of this order, which has already been directed to be taken down by the orders of this Court. Upon receiving a request, Defendant Nos. 6 and 8 will act upon the said request within 48 hours and if Defendant Nos. 6 and 8 have any reservation they will communicate the same to the Plaintiff within 48 hours so that Plaintiff can take appropriate remedial steps.

60. Upon the amended memo of parties being filed, issue notice to the said domain names and their corresponding DNRs, enlisted at Document 4 annexed with the plaint, as parties.

61. The proforma Defendants are directed to file their compliance affidavit within four (4) weeks.

62. Issue Notice to the non-appearing Defendant Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 7 through all permissible modes.

63. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC vis-à-vis the unrepresented Defendants shall be done within a period of one (1) week.

64. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **22.12.2025**.

65. List before Court on **16.04.2026**.

66. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, [www.delhihighcourt.nic.in](http://www.delhihighcourt.nic.in), shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

**MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J**  
**NOVEMBER 10, 2025/mt/IB/AM**