



\$~267 & 268

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 16492/2025, CM APPL. 67569/2025 & CM APPL. 67570/2025
CHETNA GAUTAMPetitioner
Through: Petitioner in person

(268)
+ W.P.(C) 16494/2025, CM APPL. 67573/2025 & CM APPL. 67574/2025
SHAKEEL ABBASPetitioner
Through: Mr. Shakil Sheikh, Mr. Ayush Singh,
Mr. Deepak, Ms. Jyoti Singh, Mr. Uday
Shankar, Mr. Bhuvan Jayant and Ms.
Prachi Goel, Advocates
versus

THE UNION OF INDIA & ORSRespondent
Through: Mr. Ashish K Dixit, CGSC with Mr.
Umar Hashmi, Ms. Iqra Sheikh, Mr.
Shivam Tiwari, Mr. Harshit Chitransh,
Advocates for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
30.10.2025

%

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and the petitioner-in-person.
2. On the oral prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners and the petitioner-in-person, respondent no.8 be deleted from the array of respondents. The petitioners shall file the amended memo of parties within a week.
3. By instituting the proceedings of these writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950 as Public Interest Litigation, the grievance raised is in respect of certification for exhibition granted by the Board of Film Certification constituted under Section 3 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 to a feature film titled "The Taj Story".



4. On being pointed out that the Cinematograph Act, 1952 does not contain any provision permitting the Board to review its decisions and, therefore, prayer (i) made in this regard in these petitions cannot be granted, learned counsel for the petitioner and petitioner-in-person in both the matters, have argued that as a matter of fact the petitioners are not against exhibition of film, rather they only intend that the Board may direct the producer of the film to insert a disclaimer to the effect that “the depiction made in the film is not history”.

5. Be that as it may, Section 6 of the Act provides a revisional remedy to any person who is aggrieved by certification of a film by the Board for public exhibition and, accordingly, it would be more appropriate for the petitioners to approach the Central Government by way of invoking the remedy under Section 6 of the said Act.

6. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner and the petitioner-in-person seek to withdraw the writ petitions with liberty to invoke the remedy under Section 6 of the said Act.

7. The petitions are thus dismissed as not pressed with the liberty as prayed for.

8. We, however, provide that in case any revision petition is preferred before the Central Government under Section 6 of the Act, the same shall be considered and decided in accordance with law with expedition.

9. We further clarify that any observation made by us in this order shall not be construed to be our opinion on the merits of the claim of the respective parties.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

OCTOBER 30, 2025

ॐ