

BEFORE THE FILM CERTIFICATION APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,
NEW DELHI

APPEAL AGAINST ORDER DATED 16.03.2017

FOR THE FILM - " SAMEER"

NOMAD MOVIES PVT. LTD.,
Through its Managing Director
Dakxinkumar Bajrange,
134-B Ward
Chharanagar Road
Kubernagar- 382340
Ahmedabad
(GUJARAT)

..... APPELLANT

VERSUS

THE CENTRAL BOARD OF FILM CERTIFICATION
THROUGH ITS Regional Office at 91-E,
Bharat Bhavan, Walkeshwar Road,
MUMBAI- 400 006

..... RESPONDENT

To

The Secretary,
Film Certification Appellate Tribunal,
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,
Room No. 719, "A" Wing,
Shastri Bhawan,
NEW DELHI- 110 001

Sir,

1. The Appellant is a company incorporated and registered under the Companies Act, 1956 and is engaged, inter alia, in the business of productions of Cinematograph Films. The Appellant is the producer of a Cinematograph Film titled "SAMEER", the movie in question, under the banner of 'Nomad Movies Pvt. Ltd, Ahmedabad' starring

Seema Biswas and Mohd. Zeeshan Ayub and others ('Said Film').

2. That the said movie is a fictional suspense/ thriller which revolves around investigation of a series of bomb-blast in Hyderabad and the attempts of the investigating agencies to prevent such series of bomb-blast in Gujarat in the year 2015. Thus the central plot of the movie revolves around the bomb-blasts and its aftermath.
3. That after completion of the movie, the Appellant submitted an Application to the Regional Board, Mumbai for certification of the said Film as U,U/A as per Section 5-A of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 vide its application dated 27/02/2017 as per the prescribed procedure.
4. The Regional Officer of the CBFC has accordingly informed the appellant that the film has been viewed by the Examining Committee and the Board has come to the conclusion that the film is not suitable for unrestricted public exhibition but may be suitable for public exhibition restricted to adults provided they carry out the excisions/modifications in the film listed in the Annexure and that they should accordingly be requested to carry out the excisions/modifications so that the film may be

sanctioned for public restricted to adults. For ready **reference**, relevant portion of the impugned order is quoted hereinbelow:-

Reasons for grant of “A” Certificate to the film subject to the following cuts:

Theme, treatment and presentation suitable for adults only.

Cut No.	Location	Cut Description	Guidelines
1.	08 to 09	Reduce to flash of third degree torture scene	2(iv)
2.		Delete the words “Bhosdi Ke’, `Chutiya’, `Moot Piyega’, `Pichwade Me’, `Teri Maa Ka Iski Maa Ka’, `Ma Chudane Wala’, `Madar Wala’, `Haramzaade’, `Bahanchod’, `Gand Me Bam’, `Gandu’ & `Madarchod’ wherever they occur	2(vii)
3.	00.18	Delete the dialogue “Musalman Hai Kya?”	2(xii)
4.	00:54	Remove the BJP Flag from background scene	2(xviii)
5.	16:20	Delete the word `A1- Jazeera’ (twice)	2(xii)
6.	1:52	Reduce to post blast scene to 50% especially remove the scene of nails and pieces of glass face and skin	2(iv)
7.	2:06	Delete the dialogue `Man Ki Baat’	2(xviii)

A copy of the said order dated 16.3.2017 (**Impugned**) alongwith list of cuts for getting “A” certificate is annexed hereto and marked as **Exhibit-A**.

5. Being aggrieved by the order dated 16.03.2017 bearing No. DIL/99/2017-MUM/1438 passed by the Respondent – CBFC through its Regional Officer, impugned order), the Appellant is preferring this Appeal under Section 5(c) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 against the impugned order and the impugned communication.

6. **CONCISE STATEMENT OF FACTS, LEADING TO AND NECESSITATING THE PRESENT APPEAL IS PROVIDED FOR AS UNDER:**

(a) That the said movie is a fictional suspense/ thriller which revolves around investigation of a series of bomb-blast in Hyderabad and the attempts of the investigating agencies to prevent such series of bomb-blast in Gujarat in the year 2015. Thus the central plot of the movie revolves around the bomb-blasts and its aftermath. The film also beautifully emphasizes on the power of Gandhian Ideas for Non-Violence.

(b) That on 27.02.2017, the Appellant approached the Respondent for grant of U, U/A Certificate in respect of

the said film for the theatrical release. The respondent vide impugned order dated 16.03.2017 was pleased to direct the Appellant to make certain cuts in the film for getting a “A” certificates with cuts and further observed that “*Theme, treatment and presentation suitable for adults only*”.

- (c) The Impugned Order passed by the Respondent is arbitrary, mechanical and without any reasonable conditions and the respondent has rejected the grant of U, U/A Certificate to the said Film.
- (d) Before setting out the grounds of appeal (which are without prejudice and in alternative to one another), the Appellant wishes to briefly advert to the relevant statutory provisions and Guidelines:

THE CINEMATOGRAPH ACT, 1952:

The salient features of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 are as follows:

- (i) The Cinematograph Act, 1952 provides the statutory regime for certification of Cinematograph Films for exhibition and the regulating of such exhibition;

- (ii) for this purpose, by virtue of section 2(c) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 “Cinematograph” includes any apparatus for representing of moving pictures or series of pictures;
- (iii) Section 4 and 5(a) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 provides for examination and certification of films.

5A. CERTIFICATION OF FILMS

(1) If, after examining a film or having it examined in the prescribed manner, the Board considers that—

(a) the film is suitable for unrestricted public exhibition, or, as the case may be, for unrestricted public exhibition with an endorsement of the nature mentioned in the proviso to clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 4, it shall grant to the person applying for a certificate in respect of the film a “U” certificate or, as the case may be, a “UA” certificate; or

(b) the film is not suitable for unrestricted public exhibition, but is suitable for public exhibition restricted to adults or, as the case maybe, is suitable for public exhibition restricted to members of any profession or any class of persons, it shall grant to the person applying for a certificate in respect of the

film an “A” certificate or, as the case may be, a “S” certificate, and cause the film to be so marked in the prescribed manner:

Provided that the applicant for the certificate, any distributor or exhibitor or any other person to whom the rights in the film have passed shall not be liable for punishment under any law relating to obscenity in respect of any matter contained in the film for which certificate has been granted under clause (a) or clause (b).

(2) A certificate granted or an order refusing to grant a certificate in respect of any film shall be published in the Gazette of India.

(3) Subject to the other provisions contained in this Act, a certificate granted by the Board under this section shall be valid throughout India for a period of ten years.

5C. APPEALS:

(1) Any person applying for a certificate in respect of a film who is aggrieved by any order of the Board—

- (a) refusing to grant a certificate; or
- (b) granting only an “A” certificate; or
- (c) granting only a “S” certificate; or
- (d) granting only a “UA” certificate; or

(e) directing the applicant to carry out any excisions or modifications, may, within thirty days from the date of such order, prefer an appeal to the Tribunal: Provided that the Tribunal may, if it is satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal within the aforesaid period of thirty days, allow such appeal to be admitted within a further period of thirty days.

(2) Every appeal under this section shall be made by a petition in writing and shall be accompanied by a brief statement of the reasons for the order appealed against where such statement has been furnished to the appellant and by such fees, not exceeding rupees one thousand, as may be prescribed.

GUIDELINES FOR CERTIFICATION OF FILMS FOR PUBLIC EXHIBITION:

The Cinematograph Act lays down that a film shall not be certified if any part of it is against the interest of the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or involves defamation or contempt of court or is likely to incite commission of any offence.

Under section 5B(2) the Central Government has issued the following guidelines.

A film is judged in its entirety from the point of view of its overall impact and is examined in the light of the period depicted in the film and the contemporary standards of the country and the people to whom the film relates, provided that the film does not deprave the morality of the audience. Guidelines are applied to the titles of the films also.

Objectives of Film Certification

- i) the medium of film remains responsible and sensitive to the values and standards of society;*
- ii) artistic expression and creative freedom are not unduly curbed;*
- iii) certification is responsible to social changes;*
- iv) the medium of film provides clean and healthy entertainment; and*
- v) as far as possible, the film is of aesthetic value and cinematically of a good standard.*

2. In pursuance of the above objectives, the CBFC shall ensure that

- i) anti-social activities such as violence are not glorified or justified.*

ii) the modus operandi of criminals, other visuals or words likely to incite the commission of any offence are not depicted;

iii) scenes

a. showing involvement of children in violence as victims or perpetrators or as forced witnesses to violence, or showing children as being subjected to any form of child abuse.

b. showing abuse or ridicule of physically and mentally handicapped persons; and

c. showing cruelty to, or abuse of animals, are not presented needlessly

iv) pointless or avoidable scenes of violence, cruelty and horror, scenes of violence primarily intended to provide entertainment and such scenes as may have the effect of de-sensitizing or de-humanizing people are not shown;

v) scenes which have the effect of justifying or glorifying drinking are not shown;

vi) scenes tending to encourage, justify or glamorise drug addiction are not shown;

a. scenes tending to encourage, justify or glamorise consumption of tobacco or smoking are not shown;

vii) human sensibilities are not offended by vulgarity, obscenity or depravity;

- viii) *such dual meaning words as obviously cater to baser instincts are not allowed;*
- ix) *scenes degrading or denigrating women in any manner are not presented;*
- x) *scenes involving sexual violence against women like attempt to rape, rape or any form of molestation or scenes of a similar nature are avoided, and if any such incidence is germane to the theme, they shall be reduced to the minimum and no details are shown*
- xi) *scenes showing sexual perversions shall be avoided and if such matters are germane to the theme they shall be reduced to the minimum and no details are shown*
- xii) *visuals or words contemptuous of racial, religious or other groups are not presented*
- xiii) *visuals or words which promote communal, obscurantist, anti-scientific and anti-national attitude are not presented*
- xiv) *the sovereignty and integrity of India is not called in question;*
- xv) *the security of the State is not jeopardized or endangered*
- xvi) *friendly relations with foreign States are not strained;*
- xvii) *public order is not endangered*

xviii) visuals or words involving defamation of an individual or a body of individuals, or contempt of court are not presented

EXPLANATION: *Scenes that tend to create scorn, disgrace or disregard of rules or undermine the dignity of court will come under the term "Contempt of Court"; and*
xix) national symbols and emblems are not shown except in accordance with the provisions of the Emblems and Names (Prevention of Improper Use) Act, 1950 (12 of 1950).

3. The Board of Film Certification shall also ensure that the film

i) Is judged in its entirety from the point of view of its overall impact; and

ii) Is examined in the light of the period depicted in the films and the contemporary standards of the country and the people to which the film relates provided that the film does not deprave the morality of the audience.

4. Films that meet the above- mentioned criteria but are considered unsuitable for exhibition to non-adults shall be certified for exhibition to adult audiences only.

5. i) While certifying films for unrestricted public exhibition, the Board shall ensure that the film is suitable for family viewing, that is to say, the film shall

be such that all the members of the family including children can view it together.

ii) If the Board, having regard to the nature, content and theme of the film is of the opinion that it is necessary to caution the parents 1 guardian to consider as to whether any child below the age of twelve years maybe allowed to see such a film, the film shall be certified for unrestricted public exhibition with an endorsement to that effect.

iii) If the Board having regard to the nature, content and theme of the film, is of the opinion that the exhibition of the film should be restricted to members of any profession or any class of persons, the film shall be certified for public exhibition restricted to the specialized audiences to be specified by the Board in this behalf.

6. The Board shall scrutinize the titles of the films carefully and ensure that they are not provocative, vulgar, offensive or violative of any of the above-mentioned guidelines.”

7. **GROUND OF APPEAL:**

The Impugned Order dated 16.03.2017 is ex-facie arbitrary and ultra vires the Cinematograph Act, 1952. The same is null and void and/or non-est. The same is also unreasonable,

discriminatory and/or unfair qua the appellant and indicates complete non-application of mind, for the following reasons:-

A. The Impugned Order of denial of a “U, U/A” Certificate to the Said Film by the Respondent, in purported exercise of powers under the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and without any cogent reasons, is arbitrary, bad and violative of the Fundamental right of Freedom of Trade under Article 19(i)(g) of the Constitution of India because the Respondent has completely over-looked the fact that the Appellant applied for a U, U/A certificate and the Respondent vide impugned order dated 16.3.2017 has given a “A” Certificate that also with cuts as a consequence of which the fundamental right of the Appellant to exploit the theatrical rights of the said Film has been completely violated/restrained.

B. The Respondent has rejected the U, U/A Certificate to the said Film citing guidelines Nos. 2(iv), 2(vii), 2(xii) & 2(xviii). The Appellant submits that not only is the order unreasoned and mechanical in nature but it also does not state as to how the said film violates the guidelines mentioned. However, the order merely reiterates the numbers of the

guidelines. In fact, the Film does not violate any of these guidelines for the following reasons:-

- (i) The film does not violate guideline 2(iv) because the said film is responsible and sensitive to not show any scene of violence, cruelty and horror. A showing of the reality of the society in a film does not mean that such film is showing pointless or avoidable scenes of violence.
- (ii) The Film does not violate guideline 2(vii) because the said film does not offend the human sensibilities by vulgarity, obscenity or depravity in any manner whatsoever. Every scene or dialogue in the present film is in a context of each of those scenes and not shown in a vulgar manner.
- (iii) The film does not violate guideline 2(xii) because the present film does not have any visuals or words contemptuous of racial, religious or other groups.
- (iv) The film does not violate guideline 2(xviii) because the said film does not in any manner defames any individuals or a body of individuals.

C. The Respondent has suggested the following cuts for grant of an “A” Certificate and it is most respectfully submitted that the same is not necessary and it has to be seen in the context in which it is said or shown. It is most respectfully submitted that :-

I) Cut No.1

(a) Location:- 8th minute to 9th Minute of the movie.

(b) Description:- Reduce to flash of third degree torture scene

(c) Guideline:- 2(iv)

(d) Explanation:-

The Guideline 2 (iv) prescribes that, “ *pointless or avoidable scenes of violence , cruelty and horror, scenes of violence primarily intended to provide entertainment such scenes as may the effect of desensitising or dehumanising people are not shown.*”

Thus the Guideline 2 (iv) is not applicable to the present movies as the scene from 8th to 9th minute of the movie is neither pointless and nor avoidable and is not only for entertainment purpose rather it is one of the prime and most important scenes in the movie.

In the said scene where the Police/ATS officials are shown hitting a person in their custody so as to get the consent of the character of ‘Sameer’ to be an informer of the ATS in the movies and thus to justify

his reasons for agreeing to be a police informer the said scene is very important is not at all pointless or avoidable scene. In any case in the entire scene the Police/ATS Officer hit such person with wooden stick on his feet (10-12 times), kick him (3 times) and slap him (4-5- time) thus this is not a scene where it may be stated to be desensitize or dehumanize people. In fact it would sensitise people against third degree torture. In fact there are several films/movies where the protagonist is faced with such torture or rather in more aggravated form at the hands of Police officers and such moves were given a U/A certificate by the CBFC in recent past to name a few are Chakaravyuh (2012), Talwar (2015) and Sarabjeet (2016), Visaranai (2015) where the Police/ATS officials are shown hitting a person violently.

II) Cut No.2

(a) Location :- ----

(b) Description :- Delete the words 'bhosdi ke', 'Chutiya', 'Moot Peyega', Pichwade main', Teri Maa aka Iski Maa Ka', Ma Chudanewala', Madar Wala', 'haramzada', 'Bahanchod', 'Gand me Bum', 'Gandu', and 'Madarchod' where they appear

(c) Guideline :- 2 (vii)

(d) Explanation :-

Firstly, the words 'Ma Chudaneewala' and Madar Wala' are nowhere used in the movie and there appears to be certain mistake of the Board that they have noted down these two words.

Secondly, the Appellant is ready to mute the words 'bhosdi ke', 'Chutiya', Teri Maa aka Iski Maa Ka', 'Bahanchod' 'haramzada'and 'Madarchod' whenever they appear in the movie.

The Guideline No.2 (vii) lay that the human sensibility are not to be offended by vulgarity or obscenity or depravity and further the CBFC has passed a circular thereby notifying the words which ought not be used in movies to be certified with U or U/A certificate. I say that the remaining words 'Moot Peyega', Pichwade main' and 'Gand me Bum' ought not have been objected by the Board as they are neither covered by the Guideline 2 (vii) nor the abovementioned list prohibits these words. Besides, all these words are used in a context and therefore squarely fall within four corners of the judgment in Bobby Art International & Ors versus Om Pal Singh Hoon & Ors- [(1996) 4 SCC 1]

III) **Cut No.3:**

(a) Location :- 00:18 Minute of the movie.

(b) Description :- Delete the dialogue 'Musalman Hai Kya'

(c) Guideline :- 2 (xii)

(d) Explanation:-

As per Guideline 2(xii), 'visuals or words contemptuous of racial, religious or other groups are not presented.' In the present movie this dialogue is not at all used in any derogatory manner to any religious community or any other community and does not fit into Guidelines 2 (xii). It is stated that this dialogue is used by the character (Home Minister) in the movie to enquire as to the community to which the other character belongs. Thus the said cut is uncalled for and has been suggested without any application of mind.

IV) Cut No.4

(a) Location :- 00:54 Minute of the movie.

(b) Description:- Remove the BJP Flag from background scene

(c) Guideline:- 2(xviii)

(d) Explanation:-

It is stated that in this present scene the lead characters are walking on the road and during this a auto-rickshaw passed by to which the said auto-rickshaw had attached a flag of BJP. It is further stated that the appellant never

intended to insert that rickshaw in the scene and had not noticed this auto-rickshaw before thus had no intention to cause any defamation thus the appellant has not violated the Guideline 2(xviii). In any event if this Hon'ble Tribunal deems fit, the said scene showing the BJP flag will be removed from the shot. It is a passing scene of not even a few seconds and the auto-rickshaw with flag does not even play a role in the movie.

V) Cut No.5

(a) Location:- 16:20 Minute of the movie.

(b) Description:- Delete the word 'Al-jazeera' (twice)

(c) Guideline:- 2(xii)

(d) Explanation:-

As per Guideline 2(xii), 'visuals or words contemptuous of racial, religious or other groups are not presented.' It is stated that the board has misconstrued or misunderstood the word 'Al-jazeera' to be in association with a particular religion or community. Infact Al-Jazeera is a Doha-based state-funded broadcaster owned by the Al Jazeera Media Network, and it came to fame because it was the only channel to which the terrorist organisation would send information about their attacks and ideologies. In the present movie the antagonist (terrorist) sends mails to a reporter (Aliya Irade) and in this context the word Al-

jazeera is used and the said reporter is referred as 'India ki Al-Jazeera' and then he further calls her as 'Aliya Jazeera'. So the Board has taken the word 'Al-jazeera' out of context. It is further stated that the word Al-jazeer is used only once and not twice as noted by the Board. Thus by no stretch of imagination any defamation is caused to any individual or any group by using the word 'Al-Jazeera'.

VI) Cut No.6

(a) Location:- 1:52 Minute of the movie.

(b) Description:- Reduce the post blast scene to 50% especially remove the scene of nails and pieces of glass face and skin.

(c) Guideline:- 2 (iv)

(d) Explanation:-

The Guideline 2 (iv) prescribes that, “ *pointless or avoidable scenes of violence , cruelty and horror, scenes of violence primarily intended to provide entertainment such scenes as may the effect of desensitising or dehumanising people are not shown.*” The present movie revolves entirely on the background and consequences of serial bomb-blasts and it intends to reach out to people and make them aware that the poor people, irrespective of their cast, religion and race, become the innocent victim to such act of terror.

It is submitted that the film is a fictionalised account of the Serial Bomb Blasts in Ahmedabad, Hyderabad and Bangalore. Throughout the film, there is discussion about the blasts but there is no violence relating to these blasts in the film. Only in the end, two blasts (VFX) have been shown while using only 16 shots of the injured and one or two dead people. If it is reduced violence to 50%, the effect of post blast sequences will be completely lost. It is further submitted that the horror of a blast, its victims etc. cannot be shown without at least the minimal violence. Secondly, apart of the 16 shots, there are flash back shots of the child character that gives a message of “forgiveness”. It is important moment for the whole film that reflects the Gandhian philosophy of “Forgiveness” to break the circle of violence.

It is stated that there are no glass/es on face/s in any of the shots in the blasts sequence. Only low intensity blast has been shown in the film that has nails and small iron balls (in the end it is revealed) so naturally when blast happens at least in one shot, has to show nails on the body and therefore removing that shot does not make any sense. The scene is realistic but not gruesome.

The sequence is not pointless or avoidable; it talks about the randomness and senselessness of a blast and that is the main motivational factor of the entire film.

VII) Cut No.7

(a) Location:- 2:06 Minute of the movie.

(b) Description:- Delete the dialogue Mann Ki Bat'

(c) Guideline:- 2(xviii)

(d) Explanation:-

The Board suggested to cut the word 'Mann Ki Baat' from the movie without assigning any reason as to how a generic (general) phrase in Hindi language can cause defamation to any one. They suggested the said cut citing Guideline 2(xviii). The Guideline 2 (xviii) deals with visuals or words that might cause defamation to individuals or group of body or cause contempt of court. In the present case, one of the character (Home Minister) while explaining his point of view of acting in a particular way and doing certain acts uses this word 'mann ki baat' to convey his opinion with more conviction. Therefore the said word is used in flow of conversation without any reference to any person.

In any event a generic phrase of a language (especially the one which is not abusive) can not be a subject of

copy right of one person. Hence no person can claim that the phrase 'Mann ki Baat' can not be used by any other person and if used will amount to defamation or violation of copy right.

- D. Thus the cuts suggested by the Board are in total violation of the Guidelines prescribed by the CBFC. Even the scenes where some violent shots are shown are very relevant and essential for the story to further develop and hence are not irrelevant and avoidable. It is stated that, the movie should be seen in its entirety and the message is senselessness and futility of violence of all kind.
- E. The denial of a certificate by the Respondent for the Said Film will result in huge monetary losses to the Appellant and the same will also affect the credibility of the Appellant in the film industry. The initial source of income of the Appellant would be from the theatrical release of the Said Film and eventually from the satellite release of the same.
- F. The Impugned Order dated 16.03.2017 suffers from non-application of mind and manifests complete arbitrariness on the part of the Respondent.

- G. For the reasons aforesaid and/or otherwise, the Appellant submits that the Impugned Order dated 16.03.2017 is manifestly arbitrary, irrational, unreasonable, unfair, discriminatory, and/ or erroneous. The same is also illegal and unconstitutional. Hence the Impugned Order dated 16.03.2017 is liable to be quashed and set aside.
- H. In view of the grounds stated herein, the Said Film does not in any manner violate the guidelines No. 2(iv), 2(vii), 2(xii) & 2(xviii).
8. That the Appellant craves leave to add, amend, alter, modify and/or delete any of the aforesaid grounds as may be necessary in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case.
9. That the Impugned Order was issued on 16.03.2017 and was received by the Appellant on the same day i.e. 16.03.2017 and, therefore, there is no delay in filing the present appeal.
10. The Appellant has paid the entire requisite fees of Rs. 750/- for this appeal.
- 11.** Mr. Dakxinkumar Bajrange (who is the Managing Director of Appellant –Company to sign pleadings etc.) of the Said

Film, who is conversant with the facts and circumstances of the present case, has signed, verified and declared the appeal.

12. The Appellant, therefore, humbly prays that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to:

- (i) set aside the Impugned Order dated 16.03.2017 rejecting the "U/UA" certificate with respect to the cinematograph film "SAMEER", passed by the Examining Committee of the Respondent;
- (ii) direct the Respondent to grant an "U/UA" certificate for the Said Film "SAMEER" for exhibition with bare minimum and necessary/ reasonably cuts as per the precedents set by the Respondent for the past films, if necessary;
- (iii) For cost of this appeal;
- (iv) for such further and other reliefs, as this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper in the present case.

(HARSHVARDHAN JHA)
ADVOCATE FOR THE APPELLANT

NEW DELHI
DATED: 17.04.2017

APPENDIX-II

A F F I D A V I T

I, Dakxinkumar Bajrange, Son of Shri Nandlal Shyamji Bajrange, Aged about 43 years, am the Director of the film titled "SAMEER" in Hindi language (hereinafter called 'the Film'), do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath:-

1. That I had applied for a Certificate to the Central Board of Film Certification (hereinafter called "the Board") with its Regional Office at Mumbai for the film on 27.02.2017.
2. That the Board has refused to issue a Certificate/ issued a certificate of a category other than that requested/ directed to carry out excisions or modifications.
3. That the same film will be submitted to the Tribunal as has been submitted before the Board for issue of a Certificate.
4. That the original as well as the translated script of the film is the same as submitted to the Board for issue of a Certificate; and
5. That the statements given above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DEPONENT.

VERIFICATION:

Verified at New Delhi on this the 13th day of April, 2017 that the contents of the above Affidavit are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, nothing contained therein is false or has been concealed therefrom.

DEPONENT.

BEFORE THE FILM CERTIFICATION APPELLATE TRIBUNAL,
NEW DELHI

APPEAL NO..... /2017

IN THE MATTER OF :

NOMAD MOVIES PVT. LTD.

..... Appellant

VERSUS

THE CENTRAL BOARD OF FILM CERTIFICATION..Respondent

“ SAMEER ”

I N D E X

1. Appeal Form 1 -
2. Appeal
3. **Exhibit-“A”**
(A copy of the said order dated
16.3.2017 (**Impugned**) alongwith list
of cuts for getting “A” certificate
4. Synopsis
5. Authenticated original script
Of Film
- 6 Copy of the Script Translated
in to English
7. Typed Copy of Songs
8. Copy of the order dated
16.03.2017 passed by the Regional
Officer of the Central Board of
Film Certification
9. Affidavit.