

\$~23

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

+ **W.P.(C) 13921/2018**

ANCHIT CHAWLA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Bharat Malhotra, Advocate.

versus

GOOGLE INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Ajay Digpaul, CGSC for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

21.12.2018

CM APPL. 54437/2018

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 13921/2018

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying that directions be issued to respondent nos. 1 and 2 (Yahoo India Pvt. Ltd.) to remove certain weblinks from their search engines.
4. The petitioner is, essentially, aggrieved by certain news items, which were published by certain news channels and daily newspapers. The reports published allege that the petitioner had posed as a son of an ex-policeman and had cheated certain persons. It is stated that three FIRs were registered against the petitioner relating to the aforesaid allegations. The petitioner contends that the said allegations are incorrect. In one of the cases, the petitioner and the complainant compromised. In another case, the petitioner has already filed the petition for quashing the FIR and, in the third case, the

5. trial is pending. The petitioner states that the information published is highly defamatory and does not contain the entire facts.

6. In the event, the petitioner is aggrieved by publication of any news item, it is open for the petitioner to institute an appropriate action either for defamation or otherwise. Insofar as the petitioner's prayer that respondent nos. 1 and 2 be directed to hide/remove the disclosure of the said items from the search engines is concerned, the said prayer cannot be accepted. Respondent nos. 1 and 2 manage the only search engines which enable the parties to access information that is already available in public domain. Respondent nos. 1 and 2 do not interfere with the content of any of the reports and, therefore, this Court does not consider it apposite to issue any direction to respondent nos. 1 and 2 to modify or to exclude certain discovery of certain sites.

7. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed. However, this would not preclude the petitioner from instituting any proceeding as the petitioner may be advised in respect of any publication, which the petitioner considers to be false or defamatory.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

DECEMBER 21, 2018
RK