

\$~6

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

+ W.P.(C) 3672/2012 & CM 7709/2012,12197/2012,6888/2013,5628/2014

K.N. GOVINDACHARYA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Virag Gupta, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Arvind Nigam Sr. Adv. with Mr Neel Mason,
Mr Ankit Relan, Ms Sanya Bhatnagar, Adv. for R-10.

Mr Praveen Sehrawat, Adv. for R-3.

Mr Sanjay Jain, ASG with Mr Sanjeev Narula, CGSC, Mr
Ajay Kalra, Ms Aastha Jain and Ms Shreya Sinha, Advs. for
UOI.

Mr Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv. with Ms Richa Srivastava,
Adv. for R-9.

Mr Tejas Raina, Adv. Mr Akhil Anand, Ms T. Dubey, Advs.
for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **27.04.2016**

Mr Nigam appearing for Google Inc. States that the additional affidavit has been filed as directed by this court. The additional affidavit clearly indicates that based on the verification of records maintained by Google Ireland in relation to the agreement with the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting dated 01.02.2013 and made available to the parent entity i.e. Google Inc., Google had not monetised the contents uploaded by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting on the YouTube platform under the said agreement. Mr Nigam clarifies that the expression “monetised” means that no money has been made out of the said content. Secondly, Mr Nigam also clarifies that the expression Google has been used in paragraph 5 of the said affidavit because that is the expression used in our order dated 14.03.2016 and that covers Google Ireland as well as

Google Inc. Mr Nigam Pointedly states that no revenue has been received in respect of the said content by either Google Inc. or Google Ireland just as in the case of Google India.

In view of the said affidavit and said statement, no further directions are needed in this writ petition. The writ petition stands disposed of.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

APRIL 27, 2016

kb