



\$~56

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

+ **CS(OS) 239/2025 & I.A. 9678-9682/2025**

MR NALIN SATYAKAM KOHLI

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Aman Lekhi, Sr. Adv., Mr. Shankh Sengupta, Mr. Ribhu Garg, Mr. Shreyash Sharma, Ms. Shruti, Ms. Nimisha Menon Advocates, with Petitioner-in-person through VC.

versus

D B CORP LIMITED & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Ashish Verma and Mr. Kartikay Bhargawa, Advocates for D-1, 3 and 4

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

17.04.2025

I.A. 9681/2025 (Application for exemption)

1. The present application has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking exemption from filing certified/typed/original copies of the annexures.
2. Subject to the Plaintiff filing certified/typed/original copies of the annexures within four (4) weeks from today, exemption is granted for the present.
3. Accordingly, the captioned I.A stands disposed of.

I.A. 9680/2025 (Application on behalf of Plaintiff seeking leave to place on record videographic evidence through a compact disk)



4. In view of the orders passed disposing of the main suit, the relief sought in this application does not survive for consideration. The present application stands disposed of.

I.A. 9679/2025(Application on behalf of Plaintiff seeking enlargement and extension of time for filing of Court fees)

5. The present application has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking enlargement and extension of time for filing of the Court fee.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states that Court fee has been applied for and will be deposited with the registry within two (2) weeks.

7. The time for depositing the Court fee is extended for two (2) weeks.

8. With the aforesaid directions, the application stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 239/2025 & I.A. 9678/2025

9. The present suit has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking declarations, permanent and mandatory injunctions as well as damages in relation to impugned defamatory content published against the Plaintiff. It is stated that the said impugned defamatory content is in the form of an impugned news article and an impugned video which was published on the website of Defendant No.1 and also on account handle on 'X' platform. The suit also raises a grievance vis-a-vis an impugned tweet along with a truncated version of the impugned video published by Defendant No. 2 on his personal X handle.

Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4

10. Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate enters appearance on advance service on behalf of Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4.



11. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff and Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4 submit that parties have arrived at a mutual understanding with respect to the removal of the impugned content.

12. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states that Defendant No. 1 has agreed that it will issue a corrigendum/clarification on their website and 'X' handle, with respect to the impugned news article and impugned video. He states that the agreed text of the corrigendum/clarification in Hindi language and its English translation reads as under:

“दैनिक भास्कर को मिली आपत्ति को ध्यान में रखते हुए और किसी भी तरह की गलतफहमी से बचने के लिए @nalinskohli जी का नाम और तस्वीर उस खबर के संदर्भ से हटा रहे हैं जिसमें उनके किसी राजनीतिक अभियान को लेकर सवाल उठाए गए थे। संबंधित खबर में नलिन जी की ओर से प्राप्त प्रतिक्रिया भी जोड़ दी गई है। उन्होंने आगे अब इस मामले में कोई कानूनी कार्रवाई न करने पर अपनी सहमति दी है।”

A true translated version of the above language is as follows:

“In light of the objection received by Dainik Bhaskar and to avoid any misunderstanding, we are removing Mr. @nalinskohli's name and photograph from the news item in which questions were raised about one of his political campaigns. Mr. Nalin's response has also been added to the relevant report. He has further agreed not to pursue any legal action in this matter.”

13. Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate appearing on behalf of Defendant No. 1 confirms the aforesaid submissions of the Plaintiff.

13.1. He states that in addition, Defendant No. 1 undertakes to remove the photograph and name of the Plaintiff as it appears in the impugned video. He states that the reference to the Plaintiff's name by Defendant No. 8 in the impugned video, will be censored with a 'beep' sound.

13.2. He states that reference to the name of the Plaintiff in the impugned news article authored by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 will be deleted.



14. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states that since the impugned video and impugned news article has remained in the public domain for a period of approximately seven (7) days, the Defendant No.1 has agreed to take steps to ensure that the above noted corrigendum/clarification is pinned in the 'Top News' section on Defendant No.1's website for a period of seven (7) days. Similarly, the corrigendum/clarification shall be pinned on the 'X' handle of the Defendant No.1 being @Dainik Bhaskar for a period of seven (7) days.

14.1. In reply, Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate states on instructions that this corrigendum/clarification will be published in the 'Top News' section on the website of the Defendant No.1. He states, however, as and when additional/new news articles are uploaded, the corrigendum/clarification will move down list within the 'Top News' section. He states that though Defendant No. 1 has agreed that corrigendum/clarification will remain part of 'Top News' section on the website of the Defendant No.1 and on the 'X' handle for a period of seven (7) days.

15. Further, Mr. Ashish Verma, learned counsel states on instructions that Defendant No.2 has already removed the impugned tweet and the impugned truncated video from his 'X' handle and this fact has also been verified by the Plaintiff.

15.1. He states that Defendant No. 2 has since left the employment of Defendant No. 1 on 15.04.2025

16. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states on instructions from Plaintiff that in view of the statements made by Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4, the suit can be disposed of qua the said Defendants binding them down to the said statement and no further relief is pressed qua them.



The said suggestion is also agreeable to counsel for Defendant nos. 1, 3 and 4.

17. Accordingly, the suit is disposed of qua Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4 taking the statements of Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4 on record and binding the down Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4 to the same.

Defendant No.2

18. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states that since the impugned tweet and impugned truncated video has been stated to be removed, the suit be disposed of qua the said Defendant No. 2 as well with an injunction to not re-post the said impugned truncated video.

19. Defendant No. 1 has also submitted that the impugned tweet and impugned truncated video has been removed by Defendant No. 2.

20. The Defendant No.2 had published the impugned tweet on his 'X' handle along with the impugned truncated video. Plaintiff's name and picture found mention in the said video. Since the original impugned video published by Defendant No. 1 itself has been modified, the impugned truncated video has to necessarily be in conformity with it.

21. In view of the submissions of the Plaintiff and Defendant No. 1, the suit is disposed of qua Defendant No. 2 injuncting him from re-posting the impugned truncated video.

Defendants Nos. 5, 6 to 10

22. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states on instructions from the Plaintiff that since Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4 who are the originator of the impugned video and impugned news article have undertaken to issue the corrigendum/clarification as well as modify the impugned video and



impugned news article, the Plaintiff does not press for any relief qua Defendant Nos. 6 to 10.

23. He states however, in case the Defendant Nos. 6 to 10 repost the impugned article and/or the impugned video, the Plaintiff reserves its right to initiate fresh proceedings.

24. In view of the aforesaid, the suit qua Defendant Nos. 6 to 10 is disposed of as not pressed, with liberty reserved to the Plaintiff in case any cause of action arises in future to initiate proceedings in accordance with law.

25. For the same reasons, the suit qua Defendant No. 5 is also disposed of as not pressed.

26. The aforesaid order has been passed with the consent of the Plaintiff, Defendant Nos. 1, 3 and 4.

27. No order as to costs.

28. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

APRIL 17, 2025/mt/sk

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)