

\$~43

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

+ W.P.(C) 3000/2019 & CM No. 14268/2019

PRINCE YAKUBHABEEBUDDIN TUCY Petitioner

Through: Ms Lily Thomas, Mr Saju Jakob, Mr
Ravinder Kumar Singh and Mr
Abishek Jaiswal, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr Sarat Chandra and Mr Sachin
Chandra and Ms Poonam Saha,
Advocates for R-1 and R-2.
Mr Priyanka Das and Ms Sheena
Taqui, Advocates for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

28.03.2019

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that the respondents may be restrained to release the movie '*Ram ki Janmabhoomi*'.
2. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the title of the said movie is inflammatory and refers to the dispute, which is pending before the Supreme Court of India, and now has been referred to mediation.
3. This Court does not find the title of the film to be objectionable. The contention that the title itself is inflammatory, and would lead to violence and communal disharmony is also not persuasive.
4. In so far as the release of the cinematograph film is concerned, the

learned counsel appearing for the petitioner was pointedly asked as to which dialogue or portion of the film was found objectionable by the petitioner. He had initially indicated certain dialogues; however, this court finds from the letters handed across by the learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 1 that the Censor Board has already directed excision of those dialogues.

5. It is also contended on behalf of the petitioner that the contents of the film are likely to be inflammatory and would fuel communal disharmony. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that the release of the film in question, offends Article 21 of the Constitution of India as it would put the petitioner, his family and their property in grave danger. However, there is no material on record, which would assist this Court to evaluate the aforesaid contention. No specific scene or dialogue in the film in question, has been brought to the notice of the Court, which would persuade this Court to accept this view. There is also no material for the Court to accept that the film would fuel communal disharmony.

6. It is apparent that the petitioner is apprehensive as to the contents of the film, but has had no opportunity to view the same. The petitioner's contentions regarding the film are, thus, based on mere apprehensions.

7. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, this Court considers it apposite to direct respondent no.3 to immediately arrange preview of the said movie. The arrangements for the same would be made by respondent no.3 in a convenient place in Delhi today, itself. The film would be viewed by the petitioner, as well as the learned counsel appearing for the parties in this matter. In the event, the petitioner has any objection to any scenes, the petitioner would be at liberty to apply afresh, clearly specifying the

dialogues/scenes or treatment of any subject, which the petitioner finds as objectionable.

8. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations. The pending application is disposed of.

9. Order *dasti* under signatures of the Court Master.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

MARCH 28, 2019
MK