



WEB COPY



C.S.No.50 of 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 12.07.2023

PRONOUNCED ON: 19.07.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

C.S.No.50 of 2011

- 1.Balagangadhar @ K.K.Shanmugam [Deceased]
- 2.Pusphalatha
- 3.Prabhakaran
- 4.Sanjutha

[Plaintiffs 2 to 4 are brought on record as legal heirs of deceased sole plaintiff as per the Order dated 07.12.2021 in A.No.4458 of 2021]

...Plaintiffs

Vs.

- 1.K.Shankar (Film Director)
2. The Managing Director,
Sun Tv Network Limited
Murasoli Maran Towers,
No.73 MRC Nagar, Main Road MRC
Nagar Chennai-28.

[Amended as per order dated 09.12.2022 in A.No.5260/2022]

...Defendants



C.S.No.50 of 2011

PRAYER: Plaintiff is filed under order IV Rule 1 High Court Original Side Rules R/W. Order 7 Rule 1 CPC praying as follows:-

(a) To declare the story line, screen play and the events taken part in the film Enthiran produced by the defendants herein are all based on the story written by the plaintiff in the caption of "Robot Uncle" and belongs to the plaintiff herein.

(b) To direct the defendants to render true account about the production, business made in respect of film "ENTHIRAN"

(c) To direct the defendants to pay the damages at Rs.2,25,00,000/- (Two Crores twenty five lakhs only) with the future interest at the rate of 18% per annum from the date of the plaint.

(d) to pay the cost of the suit.

(e) to grant the permanent injunction restraining the defendants from making further business with regard to the story, screen play and events belongs to the plaintiff and

(f) to pass such further or other orders as the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

For Plaintiff	:	Mr.V.Manohar
For Defendants	:	Mr.D.Saikumaran [D.1] M/s.A.L.Somayaji, Senior Counsel for M/s. Sneha [R.2]



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

The above suit has been filed by the plaintiff seeking the following reliefs:-

(a) To declare the story line, screen play and the events taken part in the film Enthiran produced by the defendants herein are all based on the story written by the plaintiff in the caption of "Robot Uncle" and belongs to the plaintiff herein.

(b) To direct the defendants to render true account about the production, business made in respect of film "ENTHIRAN"

(c) To direct the defendants to pay the damages at Rs.2,25,00,000/- (Two Crores twenty five lakhs only) with the future interest at the rate of 18% per annum from the date of the plaint.

(d) to pay the cost of the suit.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

(e) to grant the permanent injunction restraining the defendants from making further business with regard to the story, screen play and events belongs to the plaintiff and

(f) to pass such further or other orders as the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

The suit was filed by the sole plaintiff who after adducing evidence and pending the suit had passed away and his legal heirs have been brought on record and they are contesting the case.

Plaintiff's Case:-

2. It is the case of the sole plaintiff that he was associated with the film industry for over 14 years and has participated in many film productions, story writing, screen play etc. While so, in the year 1989, he had scripted a story of a Robot existing side by side with normal humans. The story was a new concept. It was written and penned by him. Thereafter, he had read out the story for his friends and relatives who had appreciated the same. In the year 1991, Producers had come forward to co-operate with



C.S.No.50 of 2011

the plaintiff to produce a film from out of this story, however, owing to paucity of funds the plaintiff was not able to proceed with the same.

3. It is also his case that he had submitted the storyline and caption for registration with the South Indian Film Chambers of Commerce which had registered it. The registration was also being renewed. The plaintiff would further submit that the story "Robot Uncle" had been extensively advertised between the years 1991 and 1992. It is his case that people who have sat for the discussion with him in the year 1990 would vouch for the same.

4. The plaintiff would submit that the 1st defendant had lifted the idea and storyline of the plaintiff and with the help of the 2nd defendant had produced the film "Enthiran". The 1st defendant had originally submitted that he had an understanding with one "Iyangran International Film Company" which was then made over to the 2nd defendant for completion of the film.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

5. After the film was released, the plaintiff's friends and relatives who had watched the said film had informed the plaintiff that the film was based on the story written and scripted by him and the entire events and narrations were from the plaintiff's story "Robot Uncle". The plaintiff would submit that it is a theft of intellectual property. Therefore, he had issued a legal notice dated 17.12.2010 to the defendants. There was no response to the same. The plaintiff would submit that the 1st defendant had on two occasions participated in the discussion of the storyline with the plaintiff. During the second session, one Jayaraman had also joined the discussion. It was the said Jayaraman who had helped the plaintiff during the period 1990 to 1995 by providing him a platform for narrating the story to various Producers and Directors. Considering the fact that the movie "Enthiran" is based on the plaintiff's story line and since the defendants are guilty of plagiarism, the plaintiff has come forward with the above suit for the reliefs stated supra.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

6. Initially the 1st defendant had, despite receiving notice not entered appearance and therefore was set ex-parte. The 2nd defendant who had entered appearance had not filed a written statement and was also set ex-parte. The records would show that thereafter the ex-parte decree against them had been set aside and they were permitted to file their written statement.

Written Statement of the 1st Defendant:-

7. The 1st defendant has countered the allegations contained in the plaint by inter alia contending that the story about humanoid robots is several decades old and is not a new concept. He would therefore submit that the plaintiff cannot claim to be the person who has invented the concept of humanoid robots. The 1st defendant would deny the contention that he had been told the story line by the plaintiff in the presence of a common person (Jayaraman). It is the case of the 1st defendant that he had developed the story of “Enthiran” several years ago as he was a Diploma Engineer and had the urge to explore science fiction characters through the creative medium of movies. Further, a reading and comparison of the defendant’s



C.S.No.50 of 2011

creation “Enthiran” and the alleged story would establish that the story of the defendants' was different from that of the plaintiff. Hollywood has many movies centering around the humanoid robots and therefore the allegation of the plaintiff that the concept put across by him in his story “Robot Uncle” was one of its kind cannot be sustained.

8. The 1st defendant would further submit that there are others who had claimed a right to the story line in “Enthiran” and who had filed their suits against the 1st defendant. C.S.No.968/2010 was filed by one P.S.Arnica Nazar. The plaintiff therein would submit that his story has been published in the year 1995. He had also filed a suit seeking a declaratory relief. One. S.Elangovan of Madurai had filed O.S.No.11382/2010 before the XIV, Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai claiming to be the 1st author of the picture “Enthiran” besides him, there were two others who had claimed right to the story line as stated by the 1st defendant. The 1st defendant would submit that the production of the movie "Enthiran" had commenced in the year 2008 and was released only in November 2010. The 1st defendant would make a legal submission that the plaint is bereft of details



C.S.No.50 of 2011

about the manner in which the copyright has been violated. There is no details as to how the plaintiff would claim that his story line “Robot Uncle” has been copied by the defendants.

9. The 1st defendant would submit that in the case of violation of a copyright, the pleadings have to be specific. The plaintiff has to come forward to show the extent of his original work that has been copied by the defendants. The pleadings have to be in greater detail. The 1st defendant would submit that the fact that there are others claiming a right on the story line would only go to show that the plaintiff cannot state that he is the owner of the script from out of which the movie ‘Enthiran’ has been produced. The defendants, therefore, seek to have the suit dismissed with exemplary costs.

Written Statement of the 2nd Defendant:-

10. The 2nd defendant would contend that the suit is barred by limitation and it is bereft of cause of action and therefore liable to be dismissed. It is also the contention of the 2nd defendant that a mere perusal



of the pleadings of the plaintiff would clearly establish that he has not personally watched the film “Enthiran” and the entire suit is only based on hearsay. The 2nd defendant would further submit that the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties in as much as the plaintiff has not chosen to implead the person who had introduced the plaintiff to various Producers and Directors for narrating the story. He would further submit that the suit which is bereft of any cause of action has to be set aside.

Issues:-

11. This Court had initially framed the following issues on 19.12.2011:-

- 1. Whether the plaintiff has scripted the story with the caption 'Robot Uncle' as a original creation of the plaintiff?*
- 2. Whether the suit against the defendants for infringement of the intellectual property right allegedly owned by the plaintiff is barred by limitation?*
- 3. Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?*



WEB COPY

4. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a declaration that the story line, screenplay and the events in the feature film "Enthiran" produced by the defendants are based on the story written by the plaintiff with the caption "Robot Uncle"?*

5. *Whether the story of 'Robot Uncle', screenplay, script and the plots provided therein were stolen by the first defendant and with the stolen story line, script and events the feature film "Enthiran" was produced?*

6. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a direction against the defendants to render account for the production and business made in respect of the film "Enthiran"?*

7. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a direction against the defendants to pay a sum of Rs.2,25,00,000/- as tentative damages with future interest @ 18% per annum?*

8. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction restraining the defendants therein making further business with regard to the story, screenplay and events which allegedly belongs to the plaintiff?*



C.S.No.50 of 2011

9. Whether the suit has been filed by the plaintiff against the defendants in order to gain unjust enrichment as claimed by the second defendant and hence the suit is liable to be dismissed with exemplary cost?

10. To what relief, the parties are entitled?

Thereafter, issues were framed by this Court on 20.10.2014 which read as follows:-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable due to the pendency of rival claims in C.S.No.914 of 2010, C.S.No.968 of 2010 and O.S.No.11382 of 2010 pending before the City Civil Court, Chennai on the same Copyright issue?

2. To what other reliefs, the parties are entitled to?



WEB COPY

12. In the written submissions, the 2nd defendant had set out the following issues:-

i) Whether the plaintiff is the author and first owner of the copyrights of the story Enthiran, which was stolen from the original story?

ii). Whether the film Enthiran is the infringed story of the plaintiff's "Robot Uncle"?

iii). Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the claim of damage?

iv). Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for?

v). Whether the plaintiff is entitled for production of accounts by the defendants of the profit made by infringing the plaintiff's story?

However, this Court is only bound by the issues that have been framed by this Court.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

13. On the side of the plaintiff, the original plaintiff had adduced evidence as P.W.1 and had examined one P.C.Selvam as P.W.2. On the side of the plaintiff Ex.P.1 to P.13 had been marked. On the side of the defendants, the defendants had examined one C.Yogesh as D.W.1. and one Jothibasu as D.W.2. Ex.D.1 had been marked through D.W.1 and Ex.D.2 had been marked through D.W.2. which are their respective authorization letters for adducing evidence.

Submissions:-

14. Mr.V.Manohar, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff would submit that the story line of the plaintiff had been registered with the South Indian Film Chamber of Commerce and the same has been stated in paragraph No.5 of his plaint which statement has not been denied by the defendants. He would also submit that the plaintiff has extensively set out in paragraph Nos.6 and 7 of his plaint, the manner in which he has narrated the story line to various Producers, Directors etc, which would go a long way to prove the plaintiff's case that it is the plaintiff's story "Robot



Uncle” which has been taken over by the 1st defendant to create the movie “Enthiran” He would further submit that the 1st defendant would claim the story to be his own creation whereas the 2nd defendant in paragraph No.12 of its written statement would submit that the story for the movie “Enthiran” was evolved from late Sujatha’s story and this has nothing to do with the plaintiff’s story. The learned counsel would submit that this is a clear contradiction.

15. He would further submit that the 1st defendant has set out dissimilarities between the story of the plaintiff and the story “Enthiran” which does not in any manner alter the fact that the basis on which the movie has been produced is on the basis of the plaintiff’s storyline “Robot Uncle”. He would submit that the allegations that there are other persons claiming a right to the story is nothing but an attempt to deflect the real issue, which is that the plaintiff has prepared the story as early as in the year 1989 and circulated the story amongst several persons. The others who had filed the suits against the defendants herein are much later in point of time.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

16. He would further submit that the plaintiff had filed Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.5 which would clearly show that the story “Robot Uncle” had been registered with the South Indian Film Chambers of Commerce as early in the year 1991. He would further submit that P.W.1 in his cross-examination stated that it was Mr.Jayaraman who had given the script to the 1st defendant which contention has not been refuted by the defendants. He would also submit that P.W.2 had been examined to prove the fact that he had accompanied the plaintiff with a story two to three times and therefore his evidence has to be taken note of to prove the plaintiff’s case that he has narrated the script to the 1st defendant herein. He would also point out that Ex.P.3 and Ex.P.4 have not been denied by the defendants. Therefore, it is the contention of the learned counsel for the plaintiff that since there is a contradiction between the evidence of D.W.1 and D.W.2 with reference to the source of the story line, it is crystal clear that the defendants have indeed copied the story of the plaintiff and therefore the plaintiff is entitled to the decree as prayed for.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

17. M/s.A.L.Somayaji, learned Senior Counsel appearing for and on behalf of the learned counsel for the 2nd defendant would submit that nowhere in the plaint, the plaintiff had pleaded the similarity between his story and the script of the movie "Enthiran". In order to prove as to how the story is similar, the pleading should contain details about the same. The learned Senior Counsel would submit that though in Paragraph No.7 of the plaint, the plaintiff has made a mention about the said Jayaraman, he has neither chosen to examine the said Jayaraman nor is there a pleading as to how the story travels from the hands of Jayaraman to the 1st defendant. The plaint is totally silent about the similarities in the story line of the plaintiff's script "Robot Uncle" and the movie "Enthiran". In the cross-examination of P.W.1, he submitted that it is only the title that had been registered and not the story. In this regard, he would rely upon the evidence of P.W.1, the plaintiff herein, which reads as follows: *"I have registered, the Robot Uncle title in the year 1991"*. That apart, he would submit that the evidence of P.W.2 cannot be relied upon for the simple reason that in the pleadings there is no reference to the said Selvam. The plaintiff who has in his pleadings



C.S.No.50 of 2011

only referred to Jayaraman has not chosen to examine the said Jayaraman and therefore, this Court has to draw adverse inference for non-examination of the said Jayaraman.

18. The learned Senior counsel would submit that there is no plea nor proof of plagiarism. In support of his argument, he would rely upon the Judgement reported in *(1978) 4 SCC 118 - R.G.Anand Vs. M/s.Delux Films and Others*, where the principles and propositions of plagiarism have been set out and it is the contention of the learned Senior counsel that none of these principles/propositions are found in the suit claim. He would also rely upon the judgement reported in *(1978) SCC OnLine Ker 209 (para.8) - Abraham Vs. Sadanandan and Others* and *(2009) 4 SCC 256 - Academy of General Education, Manipal and Another Vs. B.Malini Mallya* with reference to the effect of there being no plea nor proof of plagiarism.

Discussion:-

(i). **Issue No.3** – Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?

19. The defendants have raised a plea that the plaintiff who has come



C.S.No.50 of 2011

forward with a pleading that one Jayaraman has been the person who has connected the plaintiff with the other Producers, Directors etc, has not chosen to implead the said Jayaraman as a party to the proceeding and therefore, the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties. In my view, the said Jayaraman is not a necessary party to the proceedings since there is no relief sought for against him. The reference to him is only as a witness to the various dealings (storytelling) that the plaintiff has had with the Producers, Directors etc. It would suffice if the said Jayaraman is examined as a witness and there is no necessity to implead him as a party to the proceedings since he is neither proper nor a necessary party. Therefore, issue No.3 is answered in favour of the plaintiff. However, Jayaraman has not been examined as a witness.

(ii). Issue Nos.1, 2, 4, 5 and 6:-

20. These issues relate to the alleged ownership of the script which forms the basis for the film “Enthiran. The plaintiff has come forward with the case that the story line, events, scripts etc., belongs to him since the base of the storytelling is Ex.P.1 and P.2. That apart, it is his case that Ex.P.1 and



C.S.No.50 of 2011

P.2 have been registered under Ex.P.3, P.4 and P.5. It is also his case that under Ex.P.6, P.7 and P.8, extensive advertisements with reference to this script title “Robot Uncle” had been done by the plaintiff. The evidence would however clearly show that what is registered is only the **title** “Robot Uncle”. Further, the plaintiff has not, by any independent evidence, proved that Ex.P.1 and P.2 were indeed the story written by him and which has been shown to various Producers, Directors etc, including the 1st defendant. The fact that this story has not been registered and it is only the title that is registered, the onus is upon the plaintiff to prove that the story line which is contained in Ex.P.1 and P.2 is re-produced in the movie “Enthiran”. The plaintiff who claims that one Jayaraman had been the person who had been liasoning on his behalf with other Producers and Directors has not chosen to examine the said Jayaraman and therefore adverse inference has to be drawn against him. That apart, nowhere in the pleading or in his evidence, the plaintiff has stated as to what part of his story line, narration, or events as alleged to be contained in his story "Robot Uncle" has been copied by the defendants in the movie “Enthiran”. Except for making a bald statement that his story has been used for producing and directing the movie “Enthiran”



C.S.No.50 of 2011

there is no averments or evidence to support the said claim. Further, the plaintiff in his pleadings contended that he has not personally viewed the film “Enthiran” and it is only from the information given by others that he is stating that “Enthiran” is nothing but a copy of his story line.

21. The plaintiff in his cross-examination on 28.09.2012 stated that it is only the **title** “Robot Uncle” which has been registered under Ex.P.4 with the South Indian Film Chamber of Commerce. In the subsequent evidence on 11.06.2015, he would add that he has handed over the story also to the South Indian Film Chamber of Commerce. However, there is nothing to prove the same. A perusal of the cross-examination would further show that the 1st defendant had put questions in cross-examination narrating the story line in the movie “Enthiran” and putting it to the witness that these scenes were available in the plaintiff’s story line. The plaintiff has however answered in the negative and this would go to show that the story line in the plaintiff’s script and the story line of the film “Enthiran” is totally different. Further, the theme that a humanoid robot entering the human world and living along with humans thereby developing the human qualities is a time-



C.S.No.50 of 2011

tested story line especially in Hollywood. The plaintiff who has come forward seeking a declaration that it is his story line that forms the basis for the film “Enthiran” has failed to prove that he has created the story since the story which has been marked as Ex.P.1 and P.2 has not been registered and there is no independent evidence to show that it is the story line, scripts events etc;. which has been created by the plaintiff in the year 1989.

22. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the judgement reported in **(1978) 4 SCC 118 - R.G.Anand Vs. M/s.Delux Films and Others** was dealing with a similar case where the copyright work of the plaintiff was alleged to be the basis for the drama called "Hum Hindustan". The issues that were framed were also as to whether the plaintiff was the owner of the script and whether the film "New Delhi" was an infringement of the plaintiff’s copyright in the play "Hum Hindustani". The learned Judges have extensively discussed the Copyright Act and its violation and after discussing the various case laws in this regard both from within the country and as well as outside the country set out the following propositions, which is herein below extracted :-



WEB COPY

1. There can be no copyright in an idea, subject matter, themes, plots or historical or legendary facts and violation of the copyright in such cases is confined to the form, manner and arrangement and expression of the idea by the author of the copyright work.

2. Where the same idea is being developed in a different manner, it is manifest that the source being common, similarities are bound to occur. In such a case the courts should determine whether or not the similarities are on fundamental or substantial aspects of the mode of expression adopted in the copyrighted work. If the defendants work is nothing but a literal imitation of the copyrighted work with some variations here and there it would amount to violation of the copyright. In other words, in order to be actionable the copy must be a substantial and material one which at once leads to the conclusion that the defendant is guilty of an act of piracy.



WEB COPY

3. *One of the surest and the safest test to determine whether or not there has been a violation of copyright is to seeing the reader, spectator or the viewer after having read or seen both the works is clearly of the opinion and gets an unmistakable impression that the subsequent work appears to be a copy of the original.*

4. *Where the theme is the same but is presented and treated differently so that the subsequent work becomes a completely new work, no question of violation of copyright arises.*

5. *Where however apart from the similarities appearing in the two works there are also material and broad dissimilarities which negative the intention to copy the original and the coincidences appearing in the two works are clearly incidental no infringement of the copyright comes into existence.*



WEB COPY



C.S.No.50 of 2011

6. As a violation of copyright amounts to an act of piracy it must be proved by clear and cogent evidence after applying the various tests laid down by the case law discussed above.

7. Where however the question is of the violation of the copyright of stage play by a film producer or a Director the task of the plaintiff becomes more difficult to prove piracy. It is manifest that unlike a stage play a film has a much broader prospective, a wider field and a bigger background where the defendants can by introducing a variety of incidents give a colour and complexion different from the manner in which the copyrighted work has expressed the idea. Even so, if the viewer after seeing the film gets a totality of impression that the film is by and large a copy of the original play, violation of the copyright may be said to be proved.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

While arriving at these propositions, the Bench had quoted the example of the poet and Dramatist Shakespeare who had borrowed heavily from the Greek, Roman and British mythology to create his famous plays like The Merchant of Venice, Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, and Julius Caesar. The learned Judges had gone on to hold that though Shakespeare had borrowed from these sources ultimately he had infused his erudition and poetic exuberance to create an original work in itself. They had gone on to hold as follows:-

"Thus, the fundamental fact which has to be determined where a charge of violation of the copyright is made by the plaintiff against the defendant is to determine whether or not the defendant not only adopted the idea of the copyrighted work but has also adopted the manner, arrangement, situation to situation, scene to scene with minor changes or super additions or embellishment here and y there. Indeed, if



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY

on a perusal of the copyrighted work the defendant's work appears to be a transparent rephrasing; or a copy of a substantial and material part of the original, the charge of plagiarism must stand proved. Care however must be taken to see whether the defendant has merely disguised piracy or has actually reproduced the original in a different form, different tone, different tenor so as to infuse a new life into the idea of the copyrighted work adapted by him. In the latter case there is no violation of the copyright."

23. The learned Senior counsel has also relied upon a Judgement of the Kerala High Court reported in **(1978) SCC OnLine Ker 209 (para.8) - Abraham Vs. Sadanandan and Others** which relates to the copyright in respect of a film by name "Collector Malathy" which the plaintiff alleged was an adaptation of his Malayalam drama "Sarla Vijayam" which is written by him in the year 1948 and published in the year 1952. The learned Judge while answering the issues as to whether the plaintiff had made out a case for infringement had relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme



C.S.No.50 of 2011

Court in ***R.G.Anand*** cited supra and held that no case of infringement has been made out though the learned Trial Judge had noted a few similarities between the drama and the film and as many as 30 similar situations. The learned Judge opined as follows: “*what is required to make out a case of infringement is that on reading the screenplay and dialogue one must get an impression that this is the reproduction of the drama*”. In the instant case, the plaintiff has not even pleaded as to what are the similarities between his story line and the movie “Enthiran”. Being the plaintiff, it is for the plaintiff to prove his case. Therefore, these issues are answered against the plaintiff.

ii). Issue Nos.6, 7, 8 & 9:-

24. In the light of the above discussions, these issues are also answered against the plaintiff.

iii). Issue No.10:-

25. The plaintiff is not entitled to the decree as prayed for as he has failed to prove his case.



C.S.No.50 of 2011

WEB COPY 26. In the result, the suit stands dismissed. No costs.

19.07.2023

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
shr



C.S.No.50 of 2011

APPENDIX

List of Witnesses Examined on the side of the Plaintiffs:

1. P.W.1 - Balagandadhar @ K.K.Shanmugam (PW1)
2. P.W.2 - P.C.Selvam

List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Plaintiffs:-

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Exhibits</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description of documents</i>
1.	P-1	10.12.1989	The original manuscript of Robot Uncle
2.	P-2	-	Original screenplay script written by plaintiff
3.	P-3	27.09.1991	The original registration certificate issued by SIFCC
4.	P-4	29.09.1994	The original certificate issued by SIFCC for the period of one year from 28.09.1994.
5.	P-5	-	Original certificate issued by SIFCC in favour of the plaintiff company M/s.Thillai Film Arts.
6.	P-6	-	Photocopy of the budget for producing script "Robot Uncle"
7.	P-7	15.03.1991	The copy of advertisement in Dinathanthi
8.	P-8	-	The copy advertisement in film magazine "Tamilnadu Entertainment" in April 1991.
9.	P-9	28.06.1995	The original letter
10.	P-10	17.12.2010	The legal notice along with original receipts (5 Nos.)
11.	P-11	-	Original acknowledgment cards (2 Nos.)
12.	P-12	31.05.1993	Original letter
13.	P-13	28.08.1995	The original letter
14.	P-14	03.09.1997	The original letter
15.	P-15	27.04.1998	The original letter



C.S.No.50 of 2011

List of Witnesses Examined on the side of the Defendants:

1. D.W.1 - C.Yogesh
2. D.W.2 - M.Jyothibasu

List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Defendants:-

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Exhibits</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description of documents</i>
1.	D-1	28.09.2015	The original authorization letter
2.	M.O.-1	-	DVD of Enthiran
3.	D-2	29.05.2023	The original Board Resolution.



WEB COPY



C.S.No.50 of 2011

P.T. ASHA, J,

shr

Pre-Delivery Judgment
in
C.S.No.50 of 2011

19.07.2023