

News

Bombay High Court instructs CBFC to share objections to film on Yogi Adityanath by August 11



The Court had pulled up the CBFC for refusing to furnish the particular scenes or conversations that were judged offensive.

The Bombay High Court on Thursday asked the creators of the film *Ajey: The Untold Story of a Yogi*, partly based on a book inspired by the life of Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Yogi Adityanath, to approach the Revising Committee of the Central Board for Film Certification (CBFC).

The CBFC had earlier declined to issue the producers, Samrat Cinematics, a censor certificate for the film. They must now approach the Revising Committee of the CBFC, which has been mandated to inform the makers of the offending scenes or dialogues by Monday, August 11.

Thereafter, the makers must tell the Court of their choice on the revisions they want to make by August 12. The subject will be heard next on August 14.

A Bench of Justices Revati Mohite Dere and Neela Gokhale had earlier directed the CBFC to watch the film and pass a reasoned order.

Justice Revati Mohite Dere and Justice Neela Gokhale Senior Advocate Abhay Khandeparkar, standing for the CBFC, argued that as per the Court's instruction, the CBFC screened the film and passed a reasoned verdict on Wednesday. He further stated that the producers are at liberty to approach the Revising Committee of the Board in appeal.

He noted that the concern was not just that the film is based on a constitutional figure, but that certain parts in the movie could be regarded “defamatory” and “objectionable.”

Advocate Aseem Naphade, arguing for the makers, stated that the Board had not informed them of the offensive parts in the movie before rejecting certification. He pointed out that under Section 4(2) of the Cinematograph Act, the makers should have been told about the scenes that need to be removed.

On Wednesday, the Court had pulled up the CBFC for refusing to release the particular moments or conversations that were judged objectionable. It remarked that the two-line rationale supplied by the Board was insufficient.

“This is not enough. You are not aggrieved by the fact that the film is based on a constitutional person. If you think there are particular scenarios that are in defiance of the norms, you should have brought it to their notice.”

It orally noticed that the August 6 order passed by the CBFC was not in compliance with the norms.

Advocates Satatya Anand and Nikhil Aradhe also appeared for the filmmakers.