



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120/1

CWP-9023-2026

Date of Decision: 20.05.2026

Maninderjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Facebook Meta Platform INC and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Puneet Bali, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Yash Karunakaran, Advocate and
Mr. Aakash Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.1

Ms. Saigeeta Srivastava, Advocate
for Union of India-respondent No.2

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
(*through video conferencing*)

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of decision of respondents to remove his Facebook page 'Maninderjeet Sidhu' from website of respondent No.1.

2. The petitioner claims that he has 4.5 Lakhs followers and his Facebook page has been blocked without issuing any notice or furnishing reasons. He has been simply intimated that action has been taken pursuant to notice from Government of India/Law Enforcement Agencies under Section 79(3)(b) of Information Technology Act, 2000 (for short '**2000 Act**').

3. Learned Senior counsel for respondent No.1, during the course of hearing, submitted communication dated 20.03.2026 issued by Additional Director General of Police, Cyber Crime, Punjab. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

4. Learned Senior counsel for respondent No.1-Meta Platform Inc. submits that respondent has acted upon directions of Additional Director General of Police, Cyber Crime, Punjab. Being an intermediary and governed by 2000 Act read with Rules made thereunder, it is bound to remove content as well as block page if directed by Indian Cyber Crime Coordination Centre, Ministry of Home Affairs.

5. Faced with this, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the petition with liberty to avail remedies as permissible by law.

6. Dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid liberty.

7. Before parting with the case, it is apt to mention here that as per office report, notice upon respondent No.1 could not be served because Mukesh Kumar Jha (Clerk) who was available at the disclosed address pointed out that name of the company is incorrect. Nevertheless, there is representation on behalf of respondent No.1. The confusion has arisen on account of respondent No.1's correct name. This problem is faced by many petitioners/litigants due of lack of complete knowledge about name and status of intermediaries which are managing/operating online social media platforms.

8. To resolve the problem, Registrar General of this Court is hereby directed to issue an appropriate circular with respect to name of the



entities along with their e-mail IDs for effective advance service as well as service after notice.

9. Disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

20.05.2026
Mohit Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No