



\$~52

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

+ **CS(COMM) 106/2026**

UNION OF EUROPEAN FOOTBALL ASSOCIATIONS.....Plaintiff
Through: Mr. Sidharth Chopra, Mr. Yatinder
Garg and Ms. Disha Sharma, Advocates.

versus

LIVETV.SX & ORS.Defendants
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **05.02.2026**

I.A. 3140/2026 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 3137/2026 (for pre-institution mediation)

3. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Section 12-A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 read with Section 151 of CPC seeking exemption from Pre-Institution Mediation.
4. Having regard to the facts of the present case wherein urgent relief is prayed for and in light of the judgment of Supreme Court in *Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Keerthi, (2024) 5 SCC 815*, as also Division Bench of this Court in *Chandra Kishore Chaurasia v. RA Perfumery Works Private Ltd., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 3529*, exemption is granted to the Plaintiff from Pre-Institution Mediation.
5. Application is allowed and disposed of.



I.A. 3138/2026(exemption from advance service)

6. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Section 80 read with Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from issuing notice to Defendants No. 45/BSNL, 53/DoT and 54/MeitY.

7. On account of the urgent relief prayed for by the Plaintiff which needs hearing today, Plaintiff is exempted from serving advance notice on Defendants No. 45/BSNL, 53/DoT and 54/MeitY.

8. Application is allowed and disposed of.

I.A. 3139/2026 (u/O XI Rule 1 (4) of Commercial Courts Act, 2015 r/w Section 151 CPC)

9. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff seeking to place on record additional documents.

10. Plaintiff, if it wishes to file additional documents at a later stage, shall do so strictly in accordance with provisions of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.

11. Application is allowed and disposed of.

CS(COMM) 106/2026

12. Let plaint be registered as a suit.

13. Upon filing of process fee, issue summons to the Defendants through all permissible modes, returnable before the learned Joint Registrar on 02.03.2026.

14. Summons shall state that written statements shall be filed by the Defendants within 30 days from the receipt of summons along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.

15. It will be open to the Plaintiff to file replications within 30 days from receipt of the written statements along with affidavit of admission/denial of



documents filed by the Defendants.

16. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same be done in accordance with Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

17. The Joint Registrar shall carry out admission/denial of documents and marking of exhibits.

I.A. 3136/2026 (u/O XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 r/w Section 151 of CPC)

18. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 of CPC for grant of *ex parte* ad interim injunction.

19. Issue notice to the Defendants, through all permissible modes, returnable before Court on 23.03.2026.

20. As per the case set out in the plaint, Plaintiff is a Swiss association entered in the register of companies and an international, non-governmental, 'not-for-profit' organisation constituted as an association under the laws of Switzerland. UEFA is one of six continental confederations for association football. It constitutes the Governing Body for European football, composed of fifty-five national football Associations from Europe and Central Asia as its members, functioning as a Swiss 'association of associations'. Plaintiff has been constituted for the purposes set out in Article 2 of the UEFA Statutes, Rules of Procedure of the UEFA Congress and Regulations governing the implementation of the UEFA Statutes.

21. It is stated that among its various duties, responsibilities and activities as the governing body for football in Europe under the abovementioned statutes, Plaintiff owns and administers a wide range of international football competitions at both club and national-team level, including the UEFA



European Championship, European Qualifiers, UEFA Nations League, UEFA Nations League Finals, UEFA Champions League, UEFA Europa League and UEFA Conference League, UEFA Women's EURO and UEFA Women's Champion's League. In that capacity, Plaintiff owns all intellectual property rights relating to these competitions.

22. It is stated that UEFA operates on a 'not-for-profit' basis and redistributes revenues generated through football in accordance with the principle of solidarity and supports reinvestments across all levels of the game. Majority of the media rights' revenues derived from the competitions are distributed to participating clubs and national teams and to provide support in infrastructure, player development, medical and training facilities as well as in 'grassroots football'. Revenues from national team competitions constitute the primary source of funding for UEFA's national association members. In addition, UEFA makes solidarity payments to some clubs and national associations regardless of whether they qualify or participate in UEFA competitions.

23. It is stated that at the forefront of Plaintiff's club competitions, which are among the most prestigious and well-known football competitions in the world, is the UEFA Champions League ('UCL'), an annual competition featuring Europe's highest-ranked professional clubs. UCL is recognised as the pre-eminent club football competition in Europe and is one of the most valuable sports properties in the world. UCL is owned and administered by the Plaintiff and is conducted through a structured qualification process with six out of thirty-eight participating clubs being eliminated and followed by a league-phase round among thirty-six clubs and the two-legged knock-out phase play-off starting off with the remaining sixteen teams ('round of 16',



‘quarter finals’, ‘semi-finals’ and ‘finals’). In total, there are 189 matches played in each UCL season, commencing from September, 2025 and ending in May of the following year. UCL generates significant commercial value, *inter alia*, through broadcasting, sponsorship and licensing revenues. These are reinvested into football's development across Europe.

24. It is stated that Plaintiff is the owner of all intellectual property rights in and of the UCL. These include the copyright in the audio-visual footage of UCL matches. Such rights include, *inter alia*, the copyright and related rights subsisting in the relevant recorded and edited match footage (protected as cinematograph film) as also the right to broadcast, re-broadcast and communicate that footage to the public as well as transmit it by any means or medium, whether simultaneous or deferred. The televisual coverage of UCL matches worldwide, including in India, incorporates other additional copyright works owned by the Plaintiff including creative logos, graphics, brands, music and elements such as clock and score graphics, team line-ups and the musical anthem for the UCL, which are themselves protected as ‘original artistic’ and ‘original musical’ works (‘UEFA Copyright Works’).

25. It is further stated that the actual marketing, sales and contracting of the commercial rights to UCL is currently carried out by "UC3", a joint venture vehicle created between the Plaintiff and the European Football Clubs in 2025, which holds relevant commercial exploitation rights. *Albeit* UC3 receives licence fee revenues from broadcast partners in respect of the media rights to UCL, substantial part of the money is ultimately distributed by the Plaintiff throughout European football. Importantly, notwithstanding UC3 joint venture, Plaintiff remains the owner of all underlying intellectual property rights in the UEFA Copyright Works and which is why it has the



sole responsibility of enforcement of these rights on a global basis. This model was set-up and agreed upon, in part, with anti-piracy action in mind so that the Plaintiff could continue to enforce its rights against infringers in a centralised and coordinated manner across all its competitions around the world, including in respect of UCL in India.

26. It is stated that under its global media rights licensing model, UEFA grants media rights licences on a territory-by-territory basis to appointed media partners, undertaking not to exploit the ‘live’ rights or to authorise any other entity to do so, within the licensed territory, providing that each partner shall be the live UCL broadcast partner in the relevant territory, during the term of the applicable licence. In Indian subcontinent, Plaintiff licenses the media rights of UCL matches to Culver Max. The proprietary assets i.e., the footage comprised within the broadcaster coverage of UCL matches, including the UEFA Copyright Works and its broadcast are available on linear television through Sony Sports Network and are live-streamed through ‘SonyLIV’ i.e., broadcaster’s on-demand OTT platform. Therefore, any telecast of UCL matches in India by any entity other than Culver Max will be infringement of Plaintiff’s copyright. It follows that any unauthorised use, reproduction, distribution, communication to the public, broadcast, re-broadcast, publication, transmission of UEFA Copyright Works by any means or medium, whether simultaneous or deferred, or any other unauthorised commercial exploitation of UEFA Copyright Works in India, will directly interfere with and dilute Plaintiff’s intellectual property rights and in turn, the premium nature and value of live UCL rights licensed by UEFA to its authorised partners around the world, including Culver Max in India.



27. It is stated that the subject matter of the present suit pertains to the matches of the UEFA Champions League 2025-26 ('Event'), that commenced in September, 2025 and will conclude in May, 2026 as also UEFA Copyright in respect of the Event. Although live football matches forming subject matter of this suit are organised outside India and Plaintiff is a foreign entity, Plaintiff's copyright in UEFA Copyright Works is fully protected and enforceable in India, by virtue of Section 40 of the Copyright Act, 1957 ('1957 Act') read with the International Copyright Order, 1999 ('Order 1999'), whereby, all provisions of 1957 Act apply to works, including cinematograph films, first published or made in countries mentioned in Schedule to Order 1999 in the same manner as if the works were first published in India. Consequently, Plaintiff enjoys in India the copyright in terms of Section 14 *inter alia* to reproduce, distribute and communicate to the public in respect of UEFA Copyright Works.

28. It is stated that Plaintiff's copyright and related rights subsisting in UEFA Copyright Works, including the right to broadcast, re-broadcast, communicate etc. extend unequivocally to all upcoming matches of the Event. Therefore, any unauthorised broadcast, re-broadcast, streaming, making available for viewing or downloading or communication to the public of the Event or any part thereof, constitutes violation of Plaintiff's copyright in UEFA Copyright Works under 1957 Act.

29. It is stated that based on its past experience, Plaintiff apprehends that Defendants' websites are likely to infringe Plaintiff's copyright in respect of UEFA Copyright Works relating to forthcoming matches of the Event. A network of rogue websites has been systematically infringing not only Plaintiff's rights but also rights of several other proprietary content owners.



These rogue websites and domain names, impleaded as Defendants No. 1 to 23 (Defendants' websites), have been found streaming proprietary content relating to UCL, including in the applicable UEFA Copyright Works, in the past. These websites are engaged in unauthorised dissemination, hosting, streaming and making available to the public, unlicensed third-party content, including protected broadcasts and audiovisual works through internet, digital delivery mechanisms and mobile transmission. They operate without authorisation from lawful rights' owners and are structured with the objective of enabling unlawful consumption of copyrighted content. Defendants' websites are conducting illegal activities through primary domains and secondary domains. The operators of these primary domains create multiple sub-domains that function as mirrors, redirects or alphanumeric variations of the primary domains. Accordingly, the corresponding primary domains and their related sub-domains have been impleaded as Defendants in the present suit.

30. It is stated that Defendants' websites routinely upload, stream and make available various streams of Plaintiff's copyrighted broadcast, including matches and are *ex facie* infringing. These are evidently 'rogue' in nature inasmuch as: (i) their primary purpose is to transmit, stream, download, host, communicate and provide access to copyrighted broadcasts of the Plaintiff without any authorisation; (ii) they intentionally and systematically upload and disseminate vast volumes of infringing content, including, *inter alia*, unauthorised broadcasts of Plaintiff's events; (iii) no verifiable contact information, identification details or ownership particulars are made available on their platforms and their domain names and interfaces are pseudonymous; and (iv) their functioning demonstrates a complete



disregard for copyright, as they routinely facilitate access to content and/or broadcasts owned by the Plaintiff without obtaining any authorisation.

31. It is stated that Defendants' websites operate well-structured homepages that are systematically organised with clear categorization of content, including dedicated sections for live sporting events and highlights. Further, Defendants' websites have openly advertised and announced the availability of upcoming matches of the Event, thereby driving traffic to their infringing platforms. These actions are neither isolated nor inadvertent, but reflect a sustained pattern of unauthorised streaming, indexing and dissemination of copyrighted content, carried out with the clear objective of exploiting, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's copyrights. Conduct of these Defendants' websites squarely satisfies the indicia of 'rogue websites' as recognized by this Court in ***UTV Software Communication Ltd. and Others v. 1337X.To and Others, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8002***. Accordingly, it is imperative that Defendants' websites be restrained by an *ex parte* ad interim order.

32. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff submits that Defendants' websites are habitual in hosting illegal and pirated content. Plaintiff holds copyright under Section 14 of 1957 Act to *inter alia* reproduce, distribute and/or communicate to the public content under the UEFA Copyright Works. Plaintiff apprehends that looking at the past conduct of the Defendants' websites, they will illegally and unlawfully communicate the upcoming matches of the Event also, amounting to infringement of Plaintiff's copyright, which it is entitled to protect. Additionally, broadcast content, including footage, commentary etc., is also required to be safeguarded. Reliance is placed on the judgment of this Court in ***Universal City Studios LLC. and Others v. Dotmovies Baby and Others, 2023 SCC OnLine Del***



4955, where Court granted injunction restraining the rogue websites from in any manner, streaming, reproducing, distributing and/or communicating to the public any copyrighted content of the Plaintiffs therein, including future works. Relevant passages from the judgment are as follows:-

“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.

xxx

xxx

xxx

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/alphanumeric 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.”

33. Having heard learned counsel for the Plaintiff, I am of the view that Plaintiff has made out *prima facie* case for grant of *ex parte* ad interim injunction. Balance of convenience lies in favour of the Plaintiff and against Defendants No. 1 to 23. The issue of rogue websites engaged in piracy of copyrighted content is posing a recurring threat and there is no gainsaying that piracy must be curbed and needs to be dealt with a heavy hand. This position is acknowledged and reaffirmed in several decisions of this Court, one of which is referred to above. There is a need for immediate relief in the present case considering that ‘UEFA Champions League 2025-26’ is ongoing and will conclude in May, 2026. Delay in blocking access to Defendants’ websites and/or any other rogue websites indulging in illegal and unlawful activities, would lead to an irreparable breach of Plaintiff’s copyrights, as aforementioned, apart from revenue loss.

34. Accordingly, Defendants No. 1 to 23 and/or any person acting on their behalf are restrained from communicating, hosting, streaming, screening, disseminating or making available for viewing/downloading without authorization, any part of UEFA Champions League 2025-26, on



any electronic or digital platform, in any manner whatsoever.

35. Defendants No. 24 to 43 i.e., DNRs are directed to lock and suspend the following Domain Names of Defendants No. 1 to 23 forthwith, upon service of copy of this order by Plaintiff's counsel as under:-

S. No.	Defendant Number	Domain Names	Domain Name Registrar
1.	Defendant No. 1	livetv.sx	Ascio Technologies Inc. (Defendant No. 24)
		cdn.livetv860.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		cdn.livetv861.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		cdn.livetv863.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv819.me	NameCheap, Inc. (Defendant No. 34)
		livetv872.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv869.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv863.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv868.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv854.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)



		livetv855.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		livetv858.me	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
2.	Defendant No. 2	streameast100.is	Not Applicable
		istreameast.app	Not Applicable
3.	Defendant No. 3	strmd.link	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		streamed.pk	Not Applicable
		streamed.su	R01-Su (Defendant No. 42)
		streamed.st	Immaterialism Limited (Defendant No. 33)
		streami.su	Rucenter-SU (Defendant No. 41)
4.	Defendant No. 4	librefutboltv.su	Active-Su (Defendant No. 43)
		librefutbol.su	Ardis-Su (Defendant No. 32)
		futbollibre-tv.su	R01-Su (Defendant No. 42)
		futbollibre.mx	Registrar.eu (Defendant No. 31)
		futbollibreonline.org	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)



		futbollibre-tv.org	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
5.	Defendant No. 5	totalsportek.army	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		live4.totalsportek007.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		totalsportek007.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		totalsportekfree.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		totalsportek7.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		totalsportek1000.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		live3.totalsportek777.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		6.	Defendant No. 6
pirlotv.pl	Key-Systems GmbH (Defendant No. 35)		
7.	Defendant No. 7	rojadirecta.golf	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No. 26)
		rojadirecta.men	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No. 26)
		pirlotv.cc	Dynadot LLC



			(Defendant No. 26)
		www.futbolgratis.de	Not Applicable
		pirlotv.business	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No. 26)
		rojadirectaenvivo.pl	Key-Systems GmbH (Defendant No. 35)
		rojadirecta.ec	Not Applicable
		rojadirect.site	GoDaddy.com LLC (Defendant No. 27)
		pirlotvhd.vip	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No. 26)
		rojadirectatv.lol	DonDominio (SCIP) Soluciones Corporativas IP, S.L. (Defendant No. 36)
		rojadirectatvenvivo.me	Dynadot LLC (Defendant No. 26)
		rojadirectaenvivo.de	Not Applicable
		rojadirectatv.cv	Name Silo (Defendant No. 28)
		tarjetarojaenvivo.cx	CentralNic Ltd (Defendant No. 37)
		rojadirectatv.de	Not Applicable
		rojadirectafhd.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)



		rojadirecta-tv.net	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		rojadirectahd.com	TurnCommerce, Inc. (Defendant No. 29)
8.	Defendant No. 8	tarjetarojaenvivo.club	Squarespace Domains II LLC (Defendant No. 30)
9.	Defendant No. 9	viprow.nu	Registrar.eu (Defendant No. 31)
10.	Defendant No. 10	vipleague.pm	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)
		vipleague.st	Immaterialism Limited (Defendant No. 33)
11.	Defendant No. 11	livesports088.com	GoDaddy.com LLC (Defendant No. 27)
12.	Defendant No. 12	pelotalibrevivo.net	Squarespace Domains LLC (Defendant No. 30)
		pelotalibretv.su	Ardis-Su (Defendant No. 32)
		pelotalibre.org	NameCheap, Inc. (Defendant No. 34)
		pelotalibrehd.org	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
13.	Defendant	Fawanews.sc	Name.com, Inc.



	No. 13		(Defendant No. 38)
14.	Defendant No. 14	redditsoccerstreams.biz	TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. (Defendant No. 39)
		redditsoccerstreams.name	Key-Systems GmbH (Defendant No. 35)
15.	Defendant No. 15	streambtw.live	Not Applicable
16.	Defendant No. 16	footybite.to	Government of Kingdom of Tonga (Defendant No. 40)
17.	Defendant No. 17	sportsurge100.is	Not Applicable
18.	Defendant No. 18	hesgoal.footybite.to	Government of Kingdom of Tonga (Defendant No. 40)
		hesgoal.watch	TLD Registrar Solutions Ltd. (Defendant No. 39)
19.	Defendant No. 19	soccer-1000.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		soccer-free.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		socceronline.me	Immaterialism Limited (Defendant No. 33)



20.	Defendant No. 20	daddyhd.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		dlhd.dad	Not Applicable
		daddy livestream.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
		dlhd.link	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
21.	Defendant No. 21	streameasthd.com	Tucows Inc. (Defendant No. 25)
22.	Defendant No. 22	vipbox.lc	Immaterialism Limited (Defendant No. 33)
23.	Defendant No. 23	vipstand.pm	Hosting Concepts B.V. (Defendant No. 31)

36. Defendants No. 24 to 43 shall also file an affidavit in a sealed cover/password protected document disclosing the complete details of Defendants No. 1 to 23 as available with them, including e-mail addresses, mobile numbers, contact details, payment details and KYC details within four weeks.

37. Defendants No. 44 to 52 i.e., ISPs/TSPs are directed to block Defendants No. 1 to 23's websites immediately upon service of copy of this order by Plaintiff's counsel.

38. Defendants No. 53 and 54 are directed to issue necessary directions to all ISPs for blocking/removing access to websites as specified in paragraph 35 above.

39. During the currency of 'UEFA Champions League 2025-26', if any



further websites are discovered by the Plaintiff, which are found to be unauthorizedly streaming and communicating contents over which Plaintiff has copyrights, Plaintiff will be at liberty to communicate this information to Defendants No. 24 to 52 and on receiving intimation from the Plaintiff, Defendants No. 24 to 52 shall take steps to immediately lock/suspend the said websites and Defendants No. 53 and 54 shall issue necessary blocking orders immediately on receipt of details of these websites from the Plaintiff.

40. Plaintiff shall file affidavits from time to time furnishing details of newly discovered websites, their Domain Names, the DNRs and the URLs, in respect of which communication has been sent to the concerned entities and for which blocking orders are sought. Plaintiff shall also file appropriate applications for impleadment of the said websites and this order shall extend to the newly added Defendants.

41. If any website, which is not primarily an infringing website, is locked/suspended/blocked pursuant to this order, it may approach the Court seeking modification with an undertaking that it does not intend to illegally disseminate content over which Plaintiff has exclusive rights.

42. Plaintiff shall comply with Order XXXIX Rule 3 of CPC within a period of one week from today and file compliance affidavit within two weeks.

JYOTI SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 5, 2026

S.Sharma