



\$~6

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

CNR No. DLHC010336362026

+ **W.P.(C) 10485/2026 CM APPL. 48582/2026**

MS KIRTI DUA AND ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Pinky Anand, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Anshul Gupta, Mr. Rishabh
Darira, Ms. Adeti Salooja, Mr. Samrat
Pasriccha, Mr. Shashank Chamoli and
Mr. Vinayak Tiwari, Advocates along
with Petitioner in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC With Mr.
Akash Mishra and Mr. Arnav Mittal,
Advocates for UOI
Mr. Arvind Datar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Varun Pathak, Mr. Amee Rana,
Ms. Sana Banyal and Ms. Tanvi
Raina, Advocates for R-6
Mr. Madhav Khosla, Advocate for
R-8

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

20.08.2026

1. On the last date of hearing, this Court had passed the following order:-

“1. This petition has been filed with the following prayers: -
“i. Allow the present Petition;



ii. Issue a Writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other Writ directing the Respondent No. 1 to 5 to consider the Issuance of viable Guidelines, Regulations and Enactment of Legislation for protection of children under the age of 13 years by imposing restrictions on their social media access and regulating the content for children from the age of 13 years to 16 years of age.

iii. Issue Guidelines for Respondent No. 1 to 5, for Stricter implementation of the existing laws i.e. Information Technology Act, 2000; Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 and Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012.

iv. Direct Respondents No.1 to 5 to Issue Guidelines against circulation of inappropriate exploitative material affecting the psychological health of children.

v. Direct the Respondent No. 1 to 5 to Issue Guidelines for Imposing Overnight Curfews on the Access to Social Media Platforms for children from 13 to 16 years of age.

vi. Issue Directions to Respondent No. 1 to 5 to oversee the Operations of Respondents No. 6 to 10, so that proper Implementation of the Privacy Policies curated for children can be ensured.

vii. Issue Directions to Respondent No. 1 to 5 to ensure that Respondent No. 6 to 10, Implements a Viable Verification Model in their Interface for proper verification of user, Model like Digi Yatra should be implemented with Adhaar ID of the Child or the Child as well as the Parent, keeping in mind the privacy of the user.

viii. Direct Respondent No.1 to 5 to Issue Guidelines for Content Filtration all over the social media platforms and banning of CSAM Containing URLs as per the age bracket.

ix. Direct Respondent No.1 to 5 to Issue Guidelines and Regulations by taking inspiration from the Legislations passed by the other countries.

x. Pass order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the present case"

2. During the course of hearing, Mr. Arvind Datar, learned senior counsel appearing for META has drawn our attention to an order passed by the Supreme Court in a writ petition being W.P. (C) No. 8128/2025; Zep Foundation v. Union of India & Ors., wherein one of the issues raised in that



petition is similar to the one, which has been raised in this petition.

3. We find that the Supreme Court has disposed of writ petition by stating that the writ petitioner therein shall be at liberty to make a representation to Union of India, respondent(s) herein. The direction of the Court was also to the UOI to dispose of the representation within eight weeks.

4. On a specific query to Ms. Nidhi Raman representing Union of India/ respondent whether any representation made has been disposed of, she seeks ten days time to take instructions.

5. At her request, renotify on 20.08.2026.”

2. Today, Ms. Nidhi Raman appearing for respondent nos. 1 to 5 has drawn our attention to the communication received by her from respondent no. 1, wherein it is stated that since the relief sought in the petition is in the domain of policy, plea be made before the Court that the liberty be granted to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondents’ authorities and if such representation is made, the same would be considered and decided in accordance with law.

3. Mr. Arvind Datar, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent no. 6 would submit that respondent no. 1 while considering the representation generally takes the view of all the stake holders including the respondent no. 6.

4. If that be so, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the petition by directing the respondent no. 1 to consider that writ petition along with the note of suggestions filed on 20.08.2026 by the petitioners and pass a reasoned order on the same.

5. Liberty shall be with respondent no. 1, if deem appropriate to give a hearing to the representative of the petitioners while considering the representation and note of suggestions.



6. The petition stands disposed of along with pending applications.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

AUGUST 20, 2026/rhc