



\$~92

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

+ **W.P.(C) 1865/2026 and CM APPL. 9115/2026**

**MAHENDER CHATURVEDI**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Vineet Jindal, Ms. Urvashi, Ms. Akshita, Ms. Richa Panday, Advocates.

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR.**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr Shashank Bajpai, CGSC, Mr. Gopi Chand Nagar, Ms Aashna Mehra, Mr Vatsal Tripathi, Adv, Mr Govind Singh Chauhan, Mr. Amit Gupta, Mr. R V Prabhat, Mr. Shubham Sharma, . Mr. Yash Wardhan Sharma, Mr. Naman, Mr. Rahul Bhaskar (GP) for R-1/ UOI.

Mr Rajiv Nayar, Sr Adv Mr Saikrishna Rajagopal, Adv Mr Sidharth Chopra, Adv Ms Sneha Jain, Adv Mr Devvrat Joshi, Adv Mr Angad S Makkar, Adv Mr Abhinav Bhalla, Adv Mr Prabhav Bahuguna, Adv Mr Naman, Adv

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

%

**10.02.2026**



1. Mr. Rajiv Nayar, learned senior counsel appears for respondent no.2, and Mr. Chetan Sharma, learned ASG appears for Union of India.
2. Mr. Nayar, on instructions, places on record the stand of respondent no.2 that the producer has taken a conscious decision to change the title of the Film from “*Ghooskhor Pandat*” to an alternate title, in light of the concerns that have arisen in last few days. It is submitted that the new title shall be decided to more accurately reflect the Film’s narrative and intent. It is also submitted that the Film is a reformative, fictional police drama and the earlier title had led to unintended interpretations which do not align with the content of the Film. It is also submitted that the principal photography of the Film has been completed and the Film, at present, is at the editing stage.
3. The aforesaid statement is taken on record.
4. Submissions of Mr. Chetan Sharma, is also taken on record who contended that the Government has been given to understand about the formal statement being furnished by respondent no.2. According to Mr. Sharma, the Producer has confirmed that all promotional material pertaining to the Film has now been taken down.
5. The Court appreciates that stands taken by respondent no.2 and the steps taken by the respondent – Union of India.
6. In view thereof, nothing more is required to be adjudicated as the petitioner’s grievance stands satisfied. The petition, along with pending application, stands disposed of.
7. Needless to state that if pursuant to the proposed title of the Film, if any similar action has been initiated, the same will have to be looked into in the perspective of the statement given by respondent no. 2 and the stand



taken by respondent no.1.

**PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**FEBRUARY 10, 2026**

aks/ap