

\$~15 to 17

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

+ **W.P.(C) 610/2013 & CM No. 1155/2013**

SH. PURAN MULTIMEDIA LTD Petitioner

Through Mr.K. Datta, Adv. With Mr.Ashish
Verma & Ms.Prachi Johri, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS Respondents

Through Mr.Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI.
Mr.Neel Mason, Adv. With
Ms.Ridhima Pabi & Ms.Sanyukta
Banerjee, Advs. For R-3.

+ **W.P.(C) 5312/2013 & CM No. 11898/2013 & 36671/2018**

DHAMAAL 24 RADIO NETWORK LIMITED Petitioner

Through Mr.Angad Dugal, Adv. With
Ms.Niyati Asthana & Ms.Shilpa
Gamnani, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS Respondents

Through Mr.Rajesh Kumar, Adv. With
Ms.Santwana, Adv. For R-1.

+ **W.P.(C) 9323/2015 & CM No. 21595/2015**

HT MUSIC AND ENTERTAINMENT CO. LTD. Petitioner

Through Mr.Angad Dugal, Adv. With
Ms.Niyati Asthana & Ms.Shilpa
Gamnani, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

Through

..... Respondents
Mr.Amit Mahajan, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

27.09.2018

1. The petitioners have filed the present petitions, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to take immediate steps to reconstitute the Copyright Board in terms of the amendment to section 11 of the Copyright Act, 1957 as enacted by the Copyright (Amendment) Act, 2012.
2. Mr.Mahajan, learned counsel appearing for the respondents states that the said prayer has become infructuous as the Intellectual Property Appellate Board has been constituted, which is also to exercise the jurisdiction in terms of section 11 of the Copyright Act 1957 as amended by the Finance Act, 2017.
3. He states that in view of the above, the principal grievance of the petitioners, as raised in the present petitions, does not survive and no directions in this regard are required to be issued.
4. Section 11 of the Copyright Act, 1957 as amended in the Finance Act, 2017 does not contain any provision for constitution of a Copyright Board. It enacts that the Appellate Board as constituted under Section 83 of the Trade marks Act 1999, would “*exercise the jurisdiction, powers and authority conferred on it by or under this Act*”
5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners seek to withdraw

the present petitions in view of the above statement and the observations made by this Court with liberty to approach the Intellectual Property Appellate Board with the remaining reliefs.

6. The present petitions are, accordingly, dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty. The pending applications are also disposed of.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2018

ab

VIBHU BAKHRU, J