



\$~68

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **LPA 35/2025 & CM APPL. 2360-62/2025**

RAVINDERAppellant

Through: Mr Gaurav Jain, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIARespondent

Through: Ms Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy with
Mr Hussain Taqvi and Ms Usha
Jamnal, Advocates for UOI.

Mr Tejas Karia with Mr Varun Pathak
and Mr Thejesh Rajesndran,
Advocates for R3.

Mr Madhav Khosla with Mr Samyak
Bilal, Advocates for R6.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

15.01.2025

%

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal impugning an order dated 08.01.2025 (hereafter *the impugned order*) passed by the learned Single Judge, whereby the petition filed by the appellant being WP(C) 21/2025 captioned ***Ravinder Alias Billu v. Union of India & Ors.*** was not entertained on the ground that the appellant had an efficacious remedy of approaching the Grievance Appellate Committee.

2. The appellant had filed the aforementioned petition, [W.P.(C) 21/2025], *inter alia*, praying as under:

“(a) Issue a writ, order or direction to respondent-regulators (R1/R2) to get the impugned video (Annexure P-1) removed from the platforms of respondent-platforms (R3 – R6).



- (b) Issue a writ, order or direction to all the respondents to implement effective measures to prevent the reemergence or further circulation of the impugned video in any form, format, or derivative version on the platforms of R3 – R6;
- (c) Issue appropriate orders permitting the petitioner to approach the grievance officer(s) of the respondent-platforms to bring to their notice any instance of re-sharing/reemergence of the impugned video that escaped detection by their content recognition tools, so that they can promptly remove the video from their platforms.”

3. The appellant is essentially aggrieved by circulation of a video, which the appellant claims is defamatory and misleading. The appellant states that the said video clip was recorded in August, 2018 and circulation of the said video is causing irreparable harm to his privacy, dignity, reputation, and public standing. According to the appellant, the said video clip shows that the appellant being assaulted by a group of women. It is the appellant’s case that the said video was circulated without any contextual background and, thereby has a propensity of being misused for creating a false narrative. It is in the aforesaid context that the appellant had filed the petition praying for the reliefs as noted above.

4. Respondent nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6 are intermediaries and submit that the appellant has a remedy by raising a grievance with the concerned Grievance Redressal Officer. It is also pointed out that in the event the appellant is not satisfied with their response, the appellant could escalate the matter before the Grievance Appellate Committee, which is constituted in terms of Rule 3A of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.

5. The learned counsel appearing for respondent no.3 also submits that the appellant has not raised any grievance with the Grievance Redressal



Officer. However, this contention is disputed by the learned counsel for the appellant. He submits that a legal notice dated 16.12.2024 was issued to respondent no.3. Respondent no. 3 has thereafter called upon the appellant to file the necessary online form. Whilst the learned counsel appearing for the appellant contends that the said form was filled and submitted, the learned counsel for respondent no.3 contests the same.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the appellant further submits that the appeal to the Grievance Appellate Committee is not an efficacious remedy as the committee is required to address the grievance within a period of 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the appeal and the same would not be efficacious as the relief sought by the appellant has some urgency.

7. It is noted that the video clip in respect of which the appellant is aggrieved was made some time in August, 2018. The appellant has also sought to avail his remedies sometime in the year 2022. In view of the above, we are unable to accept that the appellate mechanism as prescribed under Rule 3A of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 does not prescribe an efficacious remedy for addressing the grievance such as raised by the appellant.

8. In view of the above, we find no infirmity in the decision of the learned Single Judge in declining to entertain the appellant's writ petition on the ground of available alternate remedies including by approaching the Grievance Appellate Committee.

9. We also note that the learned Single Judge had recorded the assurance of respondent no.1 that upon the appellant approaching the Grievance Appellate Committee, the appeal would be disposed of expeditiously.



Notwithstanding the same the appellant has not approached the Grievance Appellate Committee as yet.

10. We find no fault with the impugned order. The appeal is accordingly dismissed. Pending applications shall also stand closed.

VIBHU BAKHRU, ACJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

JANUARY 15, 2025/tr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any