



\$~2

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

+ **W.P.(C) 654/2026 & CM APPL. 3218/2026**

VIVEK MUKHERJI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sarim Naved and Mr. Mohd
Nuomaan, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ishkaran Singh Bhandari, CGSG
& Mr. Piyush Yadav, Advocate for R-
1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **17.01.2026**

1. The petition is for quashing the action/communication/request respondent no. 1-the Union of India to respondent no. 2-'X' (formerly Twitter) for removal of the petitioner's content dated 12.11.2025 on the platform. The said request/communication/action was disclosed to the petitioner by respondent no. 2, *vide* email dated 20.11.2025 (Annexure A-2).
2. The content posted by the petitioner has not been directed to be taken down or deleted, and still exists in the petitioner's 'X' account.
3. Mr. Sarim Naved, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner places reliance on paragraph 114 of the decision in the case of *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India*¹ and asserts that the impugned request for blocking the

¹ (2015) 5 SCC 1



aforesaid content was in violation of the petitioner's fundamental rights to the freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) and the freedom to carry on his occupation as a journalist under Article 19(1)(g). He also submits that the impugned request is in contravention of the scheme of Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2001 as well as the Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009.

4. No doubt, the legal position enunciated therein, will have full application in cases involving blocking of content. However, as of now, there does not seem to be any cause of action for the petition as the petitioner is unaware of the contents of the impugned request.

5. In any case, if any action is contemplated against the petitioner, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

6. If the action of the respondent no. 1 is in violation of statutory provisions or the law laid down by the Supreme Court, the same will have to be considered appropriately.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 17, 2026/p/amg