



\$~110

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2271/2026**

RAJ KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Saikrishna Rajagopal, Mr. Siddharth Chopra, Mr. Devvrat Joshi, Mr. Angad Makkar, Mr. Raghav Goyal, Advs.
Mr Sandeep Mahapatra, CGSC, Mr Kushagra Sachdeva, Government pleader

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

17.02.2026

CM APPL. 10966/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2271/2026

3. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner against the continued publication and streaming of the movie 'Lady Chatterley's Lover' in India on the platform of respondent No.2.
4. It is the case of the petitioner that he personally accessed the impugned content at his residence, where it was inadvertently exposed to his family members, including minor children, causing mental distress and intrusion into his right to privacy, dignity, and peaceful enjoyment of home under Article 21 of Constitution of India. According to the petitioner, the



impugned content contains excessively graphic sexual scenes, frontal nudity, and explicit acts which, taken cumulatively, are obscene, pornographic, and offensive to contemporary community standards, and exceed permissible limits under Indian law.

5. It is seen that though the petitioner seems to have made various complaints to multiple authorities, however, the three-tier self-regulation mechanism which has been provided under the Information Technology Act, 2000, read with Information Technology Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021 (IT Rules, 2021) has not been resorted to.

6. At the outset, Mr. Saikrishna Rajagopal, learned counsel for learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2, fairly states that the Bombay High Court in the case of ***AGIG Promotion of Nineteenonea Media Pvt, Ltd.& Ors. v. Union of India¹***, has stayed the three-tier self-regulation mechanism. However, he states that the stay therein relates to the challenge made by the operators of digital news portal and the OTT platforms like respondent No.2 are still adhering to the three-tier self-regulation mechanism.

7. Mr. Rajagopal further submits that, as per the communication dated 22.11.2025 issued by respondent no. 2, the petitioner's objections were duly considered and it was stated that the contents of the film do not violate the provisions of the IT Rules, 2021 nor do they infringe any other applicable law. It was further conveyed that, in the event the petitioner still has any subsisting grievance, he may approach the Grievance Redressal Board of the Digital Publishers Content Grievance Council, i.e, tier 2.

8. It is also submitted that the said Council is fully functional and a



former judge of the Supreme Court is the chairperson of the said Council.

9. The aforesaid statement is taken on record.

10. In view thereof, the petitioner is granted liberty to approach the concerned Council and if the petitioner does so, there is no doubt that his grievance could not be taken to its logical conclusion.

11. With the aforesaid observation, the petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/ng/mj

¹ WP(L) No.14172 of 2021