ROZNAMA

BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER

(Secretary, Electronics, Information Technology &
Artificial Intelligence Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.)

Case No: 20/2014

Date of hearing: 03.11.2026

Time of hearing: 3:00 PM Onwards

Mrs. Sheela Balaram Sharma : Complainant

V

Mr. Aditya Dhananjay Satwe & Ors. : Respondents

Documents Submitted	Hearing Order
1. Respondent No. 1 (Mr. Aditya Dhananjay Satwe) submitted their Vakalatnama in the name of Adv. Ashitosh Pawar. 2. Respondent No. 2 (Mr. Ulhas Ragvendra Amrute) submitted their Vakalatnama in the name of Adv. Ashitosh Pawar.	The petitioner has placed on record the facts of the case, stating that while the software database is substantially similar, the screens are only distinct.
	It is further contended by the petitioner that the copyright for her software subsists under the software classification, while the respondent's software obtained copyright registration under the Artistic Works section in 2010, followed by registration under the Literature Works section in 2013.
	It is further submitted by the petitioner that criminal proceedings arising out of the same dispute are sub judice before another competent court of law in Pune.

	The learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 submitted that the present matter falls within the purview of the Copyright Act. It is further submitted, relying upon the police report, that there is only 80% similarity between the two software systems. Accordingly, the counsel specifically asked for next date for fresh reply submissions on behalf of the said respondents.
	At the request of the Representative of Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, time is granted by the Adjudication Officer, to submit their fresh replies before the office of the Adjudicating Officer, accompanied by a compliance report of service. Matter adjourned accordingly.

Appearances:

1. Mrs. Sheela Balaram Sharma, Complainant;
2. Adv. Ashitosh Pawar, o/b/o. Respondent No. 1, Mr. Aditya Dhananjay Satwe, and Respondent No. 2, Mr. Ulhas Ragvendra Amrute, were present.