

News

History cannot be decided by us: PILs against The Taj Story will not be heard by the Delhi High Court.



The PILs requested that the film include a disclaimer stating that it is not based on actual events.

The two public interest litigation (PIL) petitions against the Paresh Rawal film The Taj Story, which is scheduled for release tomorrow, were denied by the Delhi High Court on Thursday.

Chief Justice Devendra Kumar Upadhyaya and Justice Tushar Rao Gedela, who made up a Division Bench, stated that the Court is not the "Super Censor Board" and that many people may interpret history differently.

"We are not a board of super censors... A disclaimer stating that this is not history is what you want. Tell me if the author of any fictional work makes it clear that this is not history. Even when it comes to history, two historians may hold differing opinions. Should we pick which historian's opinion is correct? What criteria do we have at our disposal to make this decision? The Court said.

According to the Bench, the petitioners failed to conduct adequate study before submitting their plea.

Actor Paresh Rawal shouldn't have been enlisted as a participant to the petition, it further stated.

"Why did you throw a party for star Paresh Rawal? Would you invite the lawyer as a party if you filed a contempt case tomorrow? The Court stated that since Rawal is a professional actor, he is not accountable for the content.

The Bench stated that the petitioner may take his complaint to the Central government after considering the case for a while.

In his appearance on behalf of the Union of India, Central Government Standing Counsel (CGSC) Ashish Dixit said that none of the petitioners had presented any arguments to the government.

In the end, the Court permitted the petitioners to rescind their claims and file a complaint with the Central government in accordance with Section 6 of the Cinematograph Act of 1952.

"In case any revision is filed before the Central government, the same shall be decided expeditiously," the Supreme Court ruled.

Additionally, it requested that the petitioners take Rawal's name off of the parties' memo.

Even when it comes to history, two historians may hold differing opinions. Should we pick which historian's opinion is correct?

Delhi High Court

Two public interest litigation (PIL) petitions were before the High Court, claiming that the movie offers false and inflammatory information about the Taj Mahal's past,

expressing an opinion that is at odds with accepted historical knowledge and academic consensus.

Advocate Shakeel Abbas submitted one of the petitions, but Chetna Gautam filed the other.

Abbas pleaded with the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) to either examine the film's certificate or make the necessary modifications to preserve the nation's communal peace. Additionally, it required that the film include a disclaimer acknowledging that it is addressing a contentious narrative.

Abbas contended that the film's speculative claims might undermine trust in historical research, incite social turmoil, and harm the Taj Mahal's standing as a UNESCO World Heritage Site globally.

It is suggested that the film has extremely contentious moments that could exacerbate tensions among communities and disrupt social harmony. He pleaded that the movie occasionally emphasized divisive remarks made by BJP officials and other Hindutva organizations, which could lead to communal turmoil across the country.