
(2014) 11 MAD CK 0493

In the Madras High Court

Case No : Writ Appeal No. 1443 of 2014 and M.P. No. 1 of 2014

S. Dorairaj

APPELLANT

Vs

The Central Board of Film Certification

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 07-11-2014

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2014) 11 MAD CK 0493

Hon'ble Judges : Sanjay Kishan Kaul, C.J;M. Sathyanarayanan, J

Bench : Division Bench

Judgement

Sanjay Kishan Kaul, C.J.—The appellants approached the learned Single Judge by filing a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India alleging that there were certain contentious dialogues in the Tamil film ?Velai Illa Pattadhari? in respect of the educational institutions run by Sri Ramakrishna Mission. The learned Single Judge vide impugned order dated 8.9.2014, has dismissed the petition noticing that the Central Board of Film Certification had directed the producer of the film to remove the contentious dialogues; but, in the meantime, the film had already run it's time in the theatre. Not only that, the learned Single Judge has referred to the teaching of Swamy Vivekananda to conclude that he was able to deal with ridicule of people, who thought ill of him. In this behalf, we may only quote para 8 and 9 of the impugned order, which read as under:-

?8. In this address to the Parliament of Religions on the 11th September, 1893, Swamy Vivekananda proudly proclaimed that he belonged to a country, which taught the world both tolerance and universal acceptance. If what Swamy Vivekananda said is true and if I, as well as the petitioners herein actually follow his footsteps, we should simply ignore the dialogue in question. It would be useful in these cases at least to follow the path shown by the great Masters, if not the law which is already well settled.

9. The way Swami Vivekananda himself dealt even with ridicules, is illustrated by

an interesting episode that is mentioned in a few books. While Swamiji was travelling in a train, two Europeans ridiculed him and spoke ill of him thinking that Swamiji would not understand English. But, when Swamiji spoke in chaste English to the Travelling Ticket Examiner, a co-passenger asked him why he kept quiet without retaliating. Swamiji told him that it was not the first time that he was meeting with ignorant people.?

2. We are in agreement with the conclusion of the learned Single Judge that the endeavour of the appellants would only give publicity to the film and facilitate a re-run of the film. We hope, that cannot be the objective of the appellants. We are, thus, in complete agreement with the observations of the learned Single Judge as contained in para 10, which reads as under:-

?10. It is true that the Central Board of Film Certification appears to have directed the producer of the film to remove the contentious dialogue. But, if the film, instead of running in theatres, had already run away from the theatres, it would not have been possible for the producer to delete the dialogue. By taking exception to certain dialogues, scenes, screenplay and storyline of feature films and approaching the Court for corrective action, many films get a publicity which they do not deserve or cannot afford. By admitting the writ petition and issuing notice, I do not wish to facilitate a re-run of the film. Past experience shows that due to unwarranted sensitivities exhibited by ignorant and intolerant groups of people, many films succeed in the box office. Instead of getting packed off from Theatres, such films run to packed houses by the hype created by intolerance. The law is now well settled by a series of decisions from S. Rangarajan Vs. P. Jagjevan Ram and Others, that the Court is not to act as a super Censor Board. Ignoring certain things would make them fade away from public memory much faster than objecting to them. Therefore, I do not wish to entertain the writ petition.?

3. We find no ground to interfere with the impugned order. The writ appeal stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected MP is also dismissed.