



\$~28

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

CNR No. DLHC010069882026

+ **CS(COMM) 178/2026 & I.A. 5044/2026 I.A. 5045/2026**

**DR ANIRUDDHA DHAIRYADHAR JOSHI THROUGH POWER
OF ATTORNEY HOLDERPlaintiff**

Through: Mr. R. Sudhinder, Ms. Ekta Bhasin
and Mr. Anand Amit, Advocates.

versus

JOHN DOES ASHOK KUMARS & ORS.Defendants

Through: Mr. Dhananjai Rana, CGSC for D-2
and D-3.
Mr. Aditya Gupta and Ms. Vani
Kaushik, Advocates for D-4.
Ms. Amee Rana, Mr. Yash and Mr.
Vishwajeet Deshmukh, Advocates for
D-5.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. J. BHAMBHANI**

**ORDER
15.09.2026**

%

I.A. 9474/2026

I.A. 23410/2026

By way of I.A. No.9474/2026 filed under Order XXXIX
Rule 4 read with section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908
(‘CPC’), defendant No.4 /Google LLC seeks *limited* vacation of order
dated 24.02.2026 passed in I.A. No.5044/2026, by which order this
court had *inter-alia* directed as follows:



“(ii) Defendant no.4/Google, defendant no.5/Meta Platforms and defendant no.6/X (Formerly Twitter), their principals, employees, agents, associates, representatives, licensees, as the case may be, are directed to remove/delete/take down/disable and/or cause to be removed/deleted/taken down/disabled, as the case may be, the infringing content, as identified in Annexure A attached to this Order, and content similar to the infringing content or content infringing the plaintiff’s copyright, personality rights and publicity rights, which have been uploaded from IP addresses located within India, on the domains and/or websites and/or social media platforms owned, operated and controlled by defendant nos.4, 5 and 6 from time to time, as expeditiously as possible but in no later than forty eight (48) hours from a complaint being made by the plaintiff and/or his authorized representatives;”

2. Though a reply to this application is stated to have been filed, the same is not on record by reason of an office objection. A copy of the reply is handed-up in court today and is taken on record.
3. Rejoinder has also been filed in this application, which is already on record.
4. I.A. No.23410/2026 is a joint application filed by the plaintiff and defendant No.4/Google LLC under section 151 of the CPC for disposal of I.A. No.9474/2026 on certain agreed terms as have been set-out in para 10 of that application.
5. The court has heard Mr. R. Sudhinder, learned counsel for the plaintiff; as well as Mr. Aditya Gupta, learned counsel appearing for defendant No.4/Google LLC. Since the issue raised in these two applications also concerns defendant No.5/Meta Platforms, Inc., the court has also heard Ms. Amee Rana, learned counsel for the said defendant.



6. The essence of the argument made on behalf of defendants Nos. 4 and 5 is that, though by way of para 38(ii) of order dated 24.02.2026 this court has granted to the plaintiff the liberty to approach defendants Nos.4 to 6 to seek the removal/deletion/take-down/disablement of the URLs/posts/accounts or handles if the content is “*similar to the infringing content or content infringing the plaintiff’s copyright, personality rights and publicity rights*”, it is the defendants’ contention that the relief so granted is overbroad inasmuch as it calls upon the said defendants to remove/delete/take-down/disable URLs/posts/accounts or handles in respect of which no ‘actual knowledge’ can be attributed to them by way of a court order as contemplated in ***Shreya Singhal vs. Union of India***¹. Accordingly, learned counsel appearing for the said defendants have sought appropriate directions in that behalf.
7. On the other hand, learned counsel for the plaintiff has argued that it would be extremely onerous for the plaintiff to approach this court each time content that is similar to the infringing content or content which violates the plaintiff’s copyright, personality rights and/or publicity rights is uploaded on different URLs/platforms since that would defeat the very intent and purpose of the injunctive relief granted by this court *vidé* order dated 24.02.2026.
8. In response to the plaintiff’s argument, learned counsel appearing for defendants Nos.4 and 5 submit that in order to protect the ‘safe harbour’ protection available to them as ‘intermediaries’ under section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (‘IT Act’) and the Information

¹ (2015) 5 SCC 1



Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules 2021 ('Rules'), as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Shreya Singhal* and by a Division Bench of this court in *Myspace Inc. vs. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd.*², it is not permissible for defendant Nos. 4 and 5 to remove/delete/take-down/disable content without a *specific order* from a court, *unless* they do so in accordance with their respective content policies/guidelines.

9. After a detailed hearing in the matter, and in order to resolve the concerns of both sides and relying upon the decision of this court in *Home Box Office Inc & Ors. vs. Streamzy.to & Ors.*³, para 38(ii) and 38(iii) of order dated 24.02.2026 are substituted to read as follows:

38.

(ii) Defendant no.4/Google, defendant no.5/Meta Platforms and defendant no.6/X (Formerly Twitter), their principals, employees, agents, associates, representatives, licensees, as the case may be, are directed to remove/delete/take down/disable and/or cause to be removed/ deleted/taken down/disabled, as the case may be, the infringing content, as identified in Annexure A attached to this Order. In the event the plaintiff discovers any URLs/posts/accounts or handles carrying content **identical** to the infringing content that is subject matter of the present suit, the plaintiff is at liberty to inform the concerned defendants Nos.4, 5 or 6 by furnishing to them on affidavit, the particulars of such other URLs/posts/accounts or handles alongwith supporting documentation evidencing that the said URLs/posts/accounts or handles are carrying content **identical** to the infringing content that is subject of order dated 24.02.2026, whereupon the concerned intermediary shall **technically verify** if the URLs/posts/accounts or handles are in fact carrying content **identical** to the infringing content that is subject of order dated 24.02.2026, and if so, they would enforce the injunction order granted by this

² 2016 SCC OnLine Del 6382

³ Judgment dated 27.07.2026 in CS (COMM) 740/2026



*court against such URLs/posts/accounts or handles **as a pro tem measure**. Furthermore, simultaneously with furnishing the said affidavit to the concerned intermediary, the plaintiff shall also file an application seeking to implead the URLs/posts/accounts or handles against which the interim injunction order dated 24.02.2026 is sought to be extended, and such application shall be considered by the court.*

*“If however, the plaintiff discovers other infringing content appearing on any URLs/posts/accounts or handles, which is **similar** to the content that is subject matter of the suit, the plaintiff shall be at liberty to furnish information about such content to the concerned intermediary on affidavit, whereupon the concerned intermediary may, if the content is found to be in violation of the policy/guidelines of the concerned intermediary as formulated under the provisions of the IT Act and/or Rules, the concerned intermediary shall remove/delete/take-down/disable the URLs/posts/accounts or handles carrying such content, in accordance with their policy within 48 hours of receiving such request.*

*“(iii) Defendant nos.4, 5 and 6 are directed to disclose to the plaintiff the available Basic Subscriber Information (BSI) pertaining to the URLs, posts, accounts, and handles connected with the infringing deepfake or impersonated content uploaded from IP addresses located within India, which have been blocked, removed, or disabled pursuant to the directions above. The BSI including but not limited to the name, address, phone number, email address, IP address, any other information available, and any other associated identifiers, relating to the above-mentioned URLs, posts, accounts, and handles shall be disclosed by defendant nos.4, 5 and 6 to the plaintiff in the form of password-protected file(s), within three (3) weeks from date. However, it is made clear that defendants Nos.4, 5 and 6 shall disclose to the plaintiff, the Basic Subscriber Information in relation to any **additional/identical URLs** as referred-to in para 38(ii) above only upon specific directions of this court and not otherwise.”*

10. The applications are disposed-of in the above terms.



CS(COMM) 178/2026

11. Re-notify before the learned Joint Registrar on 29th October 2026, the date already fixed.

A. J. BHAMBHANI, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2026/ak