IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON: 27-11-2025

PRONOUNCED ON: 30.01.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CS No. 456 of 2019

1. Daulat Jain
   S/o.Late Sardarmallji Jain, No.55, Narayana
   Mudali Street, Sowcarpet, Ch-79

2. Rajesh Jain
   S/o.Late Sardarmallji Jain, No.55, Narayana
   Mudali Street, Sowcarpet, Ch-79

3. Mahesh Jain
   S/o.Late Sardarmallji Jain, No.55, Narayana
   Mudali Street, Sowcarpet, Ch-79

..Plaintiff(s)

Vs

1. M/s.Times Of India
   Rep.by its Editor, Kochar Towers, No.19,
   Venkatnarayana Road, T.Nagar, Parthasarathi
   Puram, Chennai - 17 And also at Plot No.391,
   Ecstsy IT Park, Udyog Vihar Phase - 3,
   Gurgaon, Haryana – 122016.
2. M/s.Economic Times

Rep.by its Editor, Kochar Towers, No.19, Venkatnarayana Road, T.Nagar, Parthasarathi Puram, Chennai - 17 And also at Plot No.391, Ecstasy IT Park, Udyog Vihar Phase - 3, Gurgaon, Haryana - 122016.

3. Google LLC
   Rep. by its Chief Executive Officer, 1600, Amphi theatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, United States of America.

4. M/s.Sunday Guardian.com
   Rep. by its Editor, B-4, Noida Sector 3, Noida, Uttar Pradesh - 201 301.

5. M/s.Hindustan Times
   Rep. by its Editor, Hindustan Times House, 18-20, Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi - 110 001.

6. M/s.Tahelka.com
   Rep. by its Editor, Anant Media Pvt. Ltd., Building No.23, Nehru Place, New Delhi - 110 019.

7. Offshoreleaks.icij.org
   Rep. by its Chief Executive Officer, International Consortium of Investigative Journalist, 1710, Rhode Island Ave NW, 11th

Floor, Washington DC 20036,
United States of America.

8. Rediff.com
Rep. by its Editor, Mahalaxmi Engineering
Estate, No.1, L.J.Road, Mahim (West),
Mumbai - 400 016.

9. One India News
Rep. by its Editor, One.in Digitech Media
Private Limited, Nadathur Place, Plot No.23,
8th Main, 3rd Block, Jayanagar,
Bengaluru - 560 011.

10. Deleted
10th Defendant strike off
(as per order dated 08.02.2022 in
A.No.4982/2021).

11. DNAI.in
Rep. by its Editor, Diligent Media Corporation
Ltd., 11th Floor, Tower 3, India Bulls Finance
Centre, Senapati Bapat Marg,
Elphinstone (West), Mumbai - 400 013

12. M/s.Business Standard
Rep. by its Editor, Business Standard Pvt. Ltd.,
Nehru House, 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg,
New Delhi - 110 002.

13.M/s.Daily Pioneer
Rep. by its Editor, The Pioneer, CMYK
Printech Ltd., F-31, Sector 6, Noida,
Uttar Pradesh - 201 301.

14.M/s.Outlook India
Rep. by its Editor, AB-10, Block A 1 Nauroji
Nagar, Safdarjung Enclave,
New Delhi 110 029.

15.M/s.Deccan Herald
Rep. by its Editor,
The Printers (Mysore) Pvt. Ltd., 75 MG Road,
PO Box No.5661, Bengaluru 560 001.

16.Press Reader International Limited
Rep. by its Chief Executive Officer, 2nd Floor,
The Boat House, Bishop Street, Dublin 8, D08
H01F, Ireland

..Defendant(s)

PRAYER: The Plaint has been filed under Order VII Rule 1 of Code of Civil Procedure and Order IV, Rule 1 of Original Side Rules praying

(a) For a permanent injunction restraining the defendants or others their men, agents, servants or any other person or persons claiming through them from publishing/ posting any articles in magazines, posters, newspapers, articles in the websites against the plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies, which would tarnish the goodwill and reputation of the plaintiffs connecting them to the alleged 2G Scam;

(b) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to permanently remove the defamatory contents tarnishing the Plaintiffs and their business entities Doulat Jain, Rajesh Jain, Mahesh Jain and JG Group of Companies from their websites in relation to the alleged 2G Scam;

(c) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to publish an article stating the allegations mentioned earlier in their website tarnishing the image of Plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies with respect to the alleged 2G Scam, was found to be false and seek an apology in public domain;

(d) Pay the cost of the Suit including Advocate Fees to the Plaintiff; and

(e) to pass such further or other orders.

For Plaintiff(s):	Mr. Jayesh B. Dolia, Senior Counsel for M/s.Aiyar And Dolia
For Defendant(s):	D1, D2 and D8 – No appearance. D10 – No appearance. D4 to D7, D9 and D11 to D15 – Notice served – No appearance. Mr. G.Balasubramanian for M/s.Leela And Co., [for D3]

JUDGMENT

This Suit has been filed by the Plaintiffs for the reliefs of (a) permanent injunction restraining the defendants or others their men, agents, servants or any other person or persons claiming through them from publishing/ posting any articles in magazines, posters, newspapers, articles in the websites against the plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies, which would tarnish the goodwill and reputation of the plaintiffs connecting them to the alleged 2G Scam; (b) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to permanently remove the defamatory contents tarnishing the Plaintiffs and their business entities Doulat Jain, Rajesh Jain, Mahesh Jain and JG Group of Companies from their websites in relation to the alleged 2G Scam; (c) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to publish an article stating the allegations mentioned earlier in their website tarnishing the image of Plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies with respect to the alleged 2G Scam, was found to be false and seek an apology in public domain; and (d) for costs.

2. **The brief averments of the Plaint are as follows:-**

The Plaintiffs are sons of Late Mr. Sardarmallji Jain, who have joined their family business started by their forefathers under the name and style of M/s. J G Group, a well established business conglomerate that serves a broad mix of private, public and social sector institutions. During the course of their business, due to business rivalry and competitions, attempts were made by vested interest to link their names with "2G Scam" and as a result of which there were raids in the year 2010 from CBI and Enforcement Directorate in their offices and houses, which was blown beyond proportion and hyped by the media both offline in News dailies and online in TV news channels and in the internet, as if the Plaintiffs are involved in this scam and they were linked as 'Hawala dealers' etc., the media became so proactive that it started publishing articles as if the allegations against the Plaintiffs are proved. All these news report had a damaging effect on their reputation and business. The Plaintiffs are neither accused in the charge sheet nor were their names mentioned in any portion of the judgment in the complaint filed by Central Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement Directorate against Mr. A. Raja and 18 others. The Plaintiffs are not otherwise involved in any wrong doings in respect of the business transactions or otherwise, wherein they are under investigation, nor is any case pending as against them in respect of the alleged crimes of the above nature. Because of the publications in the Google Platform and other web portals owned by the defendants, the Plaintiffs are losing lot of business and their reputation is being tarnished. The Plaintiffs are facing social stigma in business and family tie-up, because of wrong and misleading publication without any truth in the same. Already the Plaintiffs sent notices to Press Trust of India, Economic Times, Times of India, Sunday Guardian, Tax Guru, Press

Reader, News 18, Hindustan Times, Defence Forum India, Tehelka etc., calling upon them to immediately withdraw the said articles from their portal and also tender apology to Plaintiffs mentioning that Mr. Doulat Jain, Mahesh Jain and Rajesh Jain and JG Group of Companies, are not involved in any of the alleged complaints and the same should be given equal importance in their website as those tarnishing articles were published. Many leading newspapers / dailies and online sites have accepted their mistake and have given a certificate that the information was obtained from the website based on which publication was made and have regretted for the mistake viz., Taxguru.in vide email dated 25.08.2018, Network 18 Media and Investments Limited vide their counsels letter dated 27.08.2018, Press Trust of India Limited vide letter dated 22.11.2018 and Google India Pvt. Ltd., in its reply dated 01.03.2019, stated that *in any case, please note that Google Search is an automated search engine that uses software known as "crawlers" to crawl the web on a regular basis and find sites to add to its index. The content on such sites is controlled by those websites, and you would therefore have to get in touch with the webmasters of those sites for the removal of the content that you find objectionable.* The defendants, even though received the notices, have failed to remove the defamatory contents or send a letter of apology. Therefore, the Plaintiffs filed this Suit.

3. **Brief averments of the Written Statement filed by the 1st defendant are as follows:-**

The Suit is barred by limitation. Since the cause of action arose on 17.12.2010 i.e. date of article published by the 1st defendant. Even according to the Plaintiffs, they themselves stated that the articles pertaining to the raids that the CBI and Enforcement Directorate undertook in the offices and houses of the Plaintiffs were published by the Media including the 1st defendant. The Plaintiffs themselves stated that all the enquiries and the raid by the CBI and Enforcement Directorate was done before filing the charge sheet. Further they themselves admitted that they are neither the accused in the charge sheet nor were their names mentioned in any portion of the judgment pronounced by the Special Judge, CBI Court in C.C. No.1 of 2014. The Plaintiffs themselves admitted that seized articles and lockers of the Plaintiffs have been released by the CBI on 17.12.2015. This being the case, the Plaintiffs, not being arrayed as accused in the charge sheet, ought to have filed the Suit within 3 years from the date of publication of the article or within 3 years from filing of the charge sheet or the CBI release order dated 17.12.2015. The 1st defendant has merely reported a fact about the CBI and Enforcement Directorate raiding the offices and houses, of the Plaintiffs, which fact have been acknowledged by the Plaintiffs themselves in the Plaint. Pursuant to the said news article, the 1st defendant has not published any material against the Plaintiffs nor have republished the said articles so as to give the Plaintiff any cause or grounds to file the present Suit. Subsequent to the publication of the said articles, no other article has been published nor have the impugned articles been re-published against the Plaintiffs. Therefore, the Suit is liable to be dismissed.

4. **<u>Brief averments of the Written Statement filed by the 2nd defendant are as follows:-</u>**

The Suit is barred by limitation. Since the cause of action arose on 17.12.2010 i.e. date of article published by the 2nd defendant. Even according to the Plaintiffs, they themselves stated that the articles pertaining to the raids that the CBI and Enforcement Directorate undertook in the offices and houses of the Plaintiffs were published by the Media including the 2nd defendant. The Plaintiffs themselves stated that all the enquiries and the raid by the CBI and Enforcement Directorate was done before filing the charge sheet. Further they themselves admitted that they are neither the accused in the charge sheet nor were their names mentioned in any portion of the judgment pronounced by the Special Judge, CBI Court in C.C. No.1 of 2014. The Plaintiffs themselves admitted that seized articles and lockers of the Plaintiffs have been released by the CBI on 17.12.2015. This being the case, the Plaintiffs, not being arrayed as accused in the charge sheet, ought to have filed the Suit within 3 years from the date of publication of the article or within 3 years from filing of the charge sheet or the CBI release order dated 17.12.2015. The 2nd defendant has merely reported a fact about the unearthing by the Research and Analysis Wing of the

Hawala transactions alleged linked to former telecom Minister A. Raja and writing to the CBI and Enforcement Directorate alleging that one of the promoters of the Chennai based JG Group, Rajesh Jain is associated with the said Hawala dealings of Raja and his associates leading to the raid by the said central agencies on the offices and houses of the Plaintiffs, which facts have been acknowledged by the Plaintiffs themselves in the Plaint. Further, the quote by the official that "so far none of the Jain brothers have been charged by the agency in the 2G scam" etc., was also prominently published in the article dated 06.08.2012. Pursuant to the said News article dated 06.08.2012, the 2nd defendant has published a follow up story on the issue on 09.08.2012 carrying the clarifications furnished by Rajesh Jain and denying setting up of dummy companies and laundering money as alleged by the RAW and stating that they don't have any reason to indulge in illegal activities anywhere in the world, thereby balancing the news report. A plain reading of the articles would thus, imply that the articles were purely a report basis the information accessed from reliable sources viz., the RAW and cannot be held to be a hearsay statement or false, misleading and defamatory. Subsequent to that the 2nd defendant has not published any material against the Plaintiffs nor have republished the said articles so as to give the Plaintiff any cause or grounds to file the present Suit. Subsequent to the publication of the said articles, no other article has been published nor have the impugned articles been re-published against the Plaintiffs. Therefore, the Suit is liable to be dismissed.

5. **Brief averments of the Written Statement filed by the 2nd defendant are as follows:-**

The news articles and other contents alleged to have been published by the Answering defendant are admittedly from 17.12.2010 to 06.08.2012, but the present Suit has been instituted on 27.06.2019. Therefore, the Suit is barred by limitation and is liable to be dismissed in *limine.* Admittedly, the issue in the present Suit is *ex facie* related to the criminal investigation against the Plaintiffs, which is a matter of public interest. Further, the defendants 1, 2, 4 to 16 are publishers / editors of newspapers, who have reported on the criminal investigation and published articles. There is an overwhelming public interest in discussion and publication of reports pertaining to the controversy at issue, the right of which is constitutionally guaranteed and protected. The Plaintiffs, have failed to aver or identify even a single URL / weblink qua the products / services of the 3rd Defendant whereupon any defamatory posts are allegedly available. The 3rd defendant is termed as ‘intermediary’ under Section 2(1)(w) of the Information Technology Act and are conferred statutory immunity under Section 79 of the said Act. The role of the 3rd defendant is limited to indexing the information already available on the internet, as created by third parties on their own websites / platforms, via Google Search. Any such impugned content is “third party content” that is (i) neither created, (ii) nor owned or (iii) otherwise controlled by the 3rd defendant. The 3rd defendant is not creator / originator / publisher as has been wrongly alleged and the present Suit is wholly misdirected and misconceived against them. If content is removed by the defendant Nos.1,2, 4 to 16, then it is removed from the platform of the 3rd defendant as well as organically delisted from the Google Search Engine. Therefore, this defendant, being intermediary, has no role to play in the present defamation Suit and no cause of action against them. The 3rd defendant is neither a necessary nor a proper party. The Google search results are not static but dynamic in nature i.e., they may vary from time to time and device to device, depending on various algorithmic factors. Therefore, providing a URL of a search conducted on Google search does not assist in identifying the exact URLs of the content being complained of by the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs have failed to plead main ingredients to constitute the defamation. The prayer sought for by the Plaintiffs are contrary to law and against the fundamental right guaranteed by Constitution of India. Therefore, the Suit is liable to be dismissed.

6. Based on the above pleadings, after hearing both sides and after perusing the entire records, this Court has framed the following issues on 29.04.2022:

1. Whether the Plaintiffs are entitled to get the relief of permanent injunction as sought for in the Plaint?

2. Whether the Plaintiffs are entitled to get the relief

of mandatory injunction as sought for in the Plaint?

3. Whether the Plaintiffs have got any cause of action against the 2nd defendant to file the Suit?

4. Whether the Court has got jurisdiction to decide the Suit?

5. Whether the Suit claim as sought for by the Plaintiffs is barred by limitation?

6. Whether the Plaintiffs are entitled for the costs of the Suit?

7. To what other reliefs, the Plaintiffs are entitled for?

7. In order to prove the case of the Plaintiff, on the side of the Plaintiffs, PW1 and PW2 were examined and Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.22 were marked. On the side of defendants, there are no oral and documentary evidences. Both sides have filed written arguments.

8. The learned Senior counsel appearing for the Plaintiffs would submit that the Plaintiffs have filed the Suit based on defamation seeking protection of their reputation and goodwill, which has been gravely tarnished by continued circulation of false and defamatory material publications allegedly linked with

"2G scam". Though several defendants were originally arrayed, the only contesting defendant is the 3rd defendant. All other defendants have either removed the defamatory content and / or tendered apologies. The continued grievance to the Plaintiffs arises solely due to continued accessibility, indexing and prominence of the defamatory material through Google Search. The Google Search is not a neutral search engine. It actively indexes, organises, ranks, amplifies and disseminates content, thereby playing a decisive role in publication and republication of defamatory material. The Plaintiffs' grievance is not with the original creation alone, but with the continued republication and discoverability of the defamatory content long after it stood discredited. The reliance placed by Google on Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 is misplaced and immunity is conditional, not absolute. The Plaintiffs issued notices and several publishers removed the content and issued clarifications. Despite this, Google has knowingly continued to index and disseminate the same defamatory links. The Plaintiffs are not seeking proactive monitoring. They seek judicial enforcement against content already proven to be false and defamatory. The cause of action in the present case is a continuing wrong, as defamatory material continues to be accessible, searchable and damaging to reputation even today. Every instance of access, search result display and reputational harm constitutes a fresh cause of action. Therefore, the Suit is well within the limitation period. The intermediary status does not confer a license to perpetuate illegality and knowledge coupled with continued inaction is sufficient to attract liability. Intermediaries lose statutory protection once they have actual knowledge of defamatory or unlawful content. Continued indexing and dissemination after notice amounts to continued publication and recurring injury. Courts are fully empowered to direct search engines to de-index unlawful content and such directions neither violate free speech nor constitute prior restraint. Therefore, the Suit has to be decreed as against the 3rd defendant by directing the 3rd defendant to comply with lawful orders of this Court.

9. The learned counsel appearing for the 3rd defendant would submit that the 3rd defendant is a Search engine and other defendants are publishers of news papers and news websites. The Google search is an automated search engine that uses software known as "crawlers" to crawl the web / internet on a regular basis and find websites to add to its index. In other words, the Google search merely performs the task of indexing information which is already available on third party websites. It neither creates, hosts, nor controls the alleged defamatory contents; its function is neutral and any storage is transient and incidental at best. The 3rd defendant can only de-index, not remove content. The actual content would continue to be an accessible on the actual website / platform upon which it is created and uploaded. Once content is removed at the source, it is organically de-indexed. In this case, the alleged defamatory posts, statements and news articles were published in physical newspapers and on line

new portals owned by the respective defendants, having been authored, created, uploaded, and published by the defendant Nos.1,2 and 4 to 16. The Plaintiffs' claim is that the these 12 URLs are screen shots of results displayed on the 3rd defendant's Google Search engine. The alleged screen shots do not bear the indicia of the 3rd defendant's search engine at all. These URLs originated from its search engine. These 12 URLs are not URLs but only hyperlinks, without displaying any content regarding the Plaintiffs and further, many of the hyperlinks are not functioning at all. The Plaintiffs failed to identify and set out the exact defamatory contents, by way of transcript and URLs, in the Plaint, so as to meet the foremost requirement of a Suit for defamation. The Plaintiffs have neither identified any defamatory content nor established that such articles are displayed on the 3rd defendant's platform. There are no documents filed to substantiate the alleged defamation. Therefore, the Suit is to be dismissed on that ground. The alleged defamatory contents were published from 17.12.2010 to 06.08.2012. But the present Suit has been filed on 27.06.2019. Therefore, the Suit is barred by limitation.

9.1. While the other defendants have removed the alleged defamatory contents from their platforms. The 3rd defendant does not host any content. It merely indexes information already available on third party websites. Therefore, it is the duty of the Plaintiffs to identify and set out the specific defamatory content, including transcripts and specific URLs. The Plaintiffs seek to de-index new allegedly defamatory news articles, however, the said contents have not been identified by their respective URLs and not part of the Plaint or its documents. The 3rd defendant is termed as "intermediary" and are conferred statutory immunity under Section 79 of the said Act. The role of the 3rd defendant is limited to indexing the information already available on the internet, as created by third parties on their own websites / platforms. The 3rd defendant does not host any of the alleged defamatory content and the same is hosted on the platforms / websites of 3rd party defendants and operators and the prayers are misdirected and ougth not to be granted. If any content has been published by the defendant 1,2 and 4 to 16 on their websites, then they can be directed to take the same down and no orders ought to be passed against the 3rd defendant. Therefore, Suit against the defendant is liable to be dismissed.

10. Heard both sides and perused the entire materials.

11. In this case, initially the Plaintiffs have filed the Suit for the reliefs of (a) For a permanent injunction restraining the defendants or others their men, agents, servants or any other person or persons claiming through them from publishing/ posting any articles in magazines, posters, newspapers, articles in the websites against the plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies, which would tarnish the goodwill and reputation of the plaintiffs connecting them to the alleged 2G Scam; (b) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to permanently remove the defamatory

contents tarnishing the Plaintiffs and their business entities Doulat Jain, Rajesh Jain, Mahesh Jain and JG Group of Companies from their websites in relation to the alleged 2G Scam; (c) For a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants or others to publish an article stating the allegations mentioned earlier in their website tarnishing the image of Plaintiffs and their business entities JG Group of Companies with respect to the alleged 2G Scam, was found to be false and seek an apology in public domain; and (d) for costs. On the side of the Plaintiffs, PW1 and PW2 were examined and Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.22 were marked. On the side of the defendants, no oral or documentary evidences have been adduced. During the pendency of the Suit, the defendants removed the defamatory contents and also tendered apology, thereby the Plaintiffs contested the Suit only as against the 3rd defendant to remove the contents in the 3rd defendant's platform.

12. According to the 3rd defendant, they are only "intermediaries" and they do not host any contents. The 3rd defendant neither created nor owned or otherwise controlled any contents mentioned in the Plaint. Therefore, even according to the Plaintiffs, they have not sought for reliefs as against the other defendants and sought for reliefs only as against the 3rd defendant. Since the 3rd defendant is only an intermediary, he is noway connected with the contents posted by the other defendants and already those contents were removed, thereby the prayers against the other defendants have been 'not pressed' by the

Plaintiffs. Therefore, there is no further order required to be passed as against the 3rd defendant. Moreover, the Plaintiffs have not produced any Identification proof for the contents available with the 3rd defendant and without any identification, the 3rd defendant cannot remove the contents. Further, the alleged contents were posted by the other defendants as early as between 2010 and 2012, thereby it is very difficult to identify the contents. Therefore, the Plaintiffs cannot seek any direction as against the 3rd defendant without providing any identification. Further there is no specific content pleaded by the Plaintiffs as against the 3rd defendant. Therefore, the blanket order cannot be issued and thereby, the Suit is liable to be dismissed.

13. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Plaintiffs has relied upon the following judgments:

(i) "X" vs. Union of India and others reported in 2021 SCC Online Del 1788;

(ii) Google India Private Limited vs. Visaka Industries reported in (2020) 4 Supreme Court Cases 162.

(iii) Suki Sivam vs. You Tube, Google LLC and others in C.S. No.153 of 2021.

On a careful perusal of the above judgments, it is clear that *exemption provided to an intermediary under Section 79(1) is subject to conditions prescribed in Sections 79(2) and 79(3) lays down the circumstances wherein the* *exemption stands withdrawn by operation of law. The protection of law is available to an intermediary so long as it acts a mere conduit for transmission of information without knowledge of offence if any committed through its platform. The protection is lost if it comes to the knowledge of the intermediary that the information is offending or the intermediary is a conspirator or abettor of the offence. Claim of blanket immunity by an intermediary under unamended Section 79 is untenable.*

13.1. In the case on hand, the Plaintiffs have not even produced the specific address, location, URL and contact details etc., and therefore, the above said case laws are noway helpful to decide the case of the Plaintiffs. Moreover, the Suit against the defendants 1 and 2 was dismissed by this Court through an order dated 08.08.2023 and thereafter, as against the other defendants, no claim has been pressed by the Plaintiffs and only as against the 3rd defendant, the claim has been pressed and the Plaintiffs are not able to identify due to en-number of platforms and the contents available in those platforms.

14. The learned counsel appearing for the 3rd defendant has relied upon judgment in ***Shreya Singhal v. Union of India reported in AIR 2015 SC 1523. On*** a careful perusal of the above said judgment, it is clear that *in order to ensure exemption from liability under Section 79(2)(c) of Information Technology Act, an* intermediary observes due diligence while discharging his

duties under this Act and also observes such other guidelines as the Central *Government may prescribe in this behalf.* In the case on hand, there is no any allegation as against the 3rd defendant and only because of the alleged contents hosted in the platform of the 3rd defendant, he has been added as a party, but without any particulars to identify the content, it is not appropriate to grant decree as against the 3rd defendant. Since the claim against the main defendants, who published the articles have been 'not pressed' by the Plaintiffs, this Court need not go for answering issues as the prayers become 'infructuous'. However, even after settling the issues between the parties, if any contents available in the public platform, then it should be removed. As on date, the Plaintiffs are unable to identify the specific contents with transcripts and specific URLs. If the Plaintiff is able to identify the content transcription and the specific URL identity, then he can make request to the 3rd defendant ***within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgement*** **and after receipt of such request, if any,** the 3rd defendant has to remove the said contents ***within 15 days from the date of receipt of such request from the Plaintiffs.***

15. In the result, with the above said terms, the ***Civil Suit is dismissed.*** There shall be no order as to costs.

….01.2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MJS

APPENDIX:

List of Plaintiff side Witnesses:

PW1 : Mr. Dowlat Jain

PW2 : Mr. Rajesh Jain

List of Plaintiff side Documents:

Exhibit No.	Date	Description of Documents
Ex.P.1	-	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 3rd defendant's website on various dates.
Ex.P.2	24.07.2018	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 4th defendant's website.
Ex.P.3	24.07.2018	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 5th defendant's website.
Ex.P.4	24.07.2018	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 6th

		defendant's website.
Ex.P.5	21.06.2019	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 7th defendant's website.
Ex.P.6	15.12.2010	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 8th defendant's website.
Ex.P.7	15.12.2010	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 9th defendant's website.
Ex.P.8.	27.12.2010	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 11th defendant's website.
Ex.P.9.	21.01.2013	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 12th defendant's website.
Ex.P.10	15.07.2015	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 13th defendant's website.
Ex.P.11	03.08.2015	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 14th defendant's website.
Ex.P.12	24.07.2015	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 15th defendant's website.
Ex.P.13	15.07.2015	Computer printout of the defamatory article about the Plaintiffs downloaded from 16th defendant's website.
Ex.P.14 series	09.07.2010 and 15.12.2010	Computer print outs of the defamatory articles about the Plaintiffs downloaded from other websites.
Ex.P.15	-	Printout of the Judgment of 2G Spectrum Cases.
Ex.P.16 series	-	Office copies of Legal Notices from the Counsels for Plaintiffs to the defendants on various dates.

Ex.P.17 series (2 nos).	-	Return covers.
Ex.P.18	01.03.2019	Original reply from Google India Pvt. Ltd., to the counsel for Plaintiffs.
Ex.P.19	22.11.2018	Original reply from Press Trust of India Limited to counsel for Plaintiffs.
Ex.P.20	25.08.2018	Original reply from Taxguru.in to Counsel for Plaintiffs.
Ex.P.21	27.08.2018	Printout of the reply from the Counsel for Network 18 Media and Investments Limited (NEWS 18) to the Counsel for Plaintiffs.
Ex.P.22	17.12.2015	Certified copy of the order passed in C.C. No.1/11 (04), 2G Spectrum Case, New Delhi.

List of Defendant side Witnesses and documents: **NIL**

30.01.2026

To

The Sub-Assistant Registrar (Original side),
High Court, Madras.

P.DHANABAL, J.

MJS

CS No. 456 of 2019

30.01.2026