



\$~12

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

%

Date of Decision: 10.04.2026

+ **FAO (COMM) 54/2026 CM APPL. 11603/2026**

INFO EDGE INDIA LTD

.....Appellant

Through: Ms Swathi Sukumar, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Rishabh Sharma, Mr. Aman
Taneja, Ms. Vanshika Thapliyal and
Ms Ambica Sood, Advocates

versus

SYNAPSEINDIA OUTSOURCING PVT LTD & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Bhuvanesh Sehgal, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present appeal has been filed by the Appellant against the order dated 15.01.2026 ['impugned order'] wherein the District Judge (Commercial Court) - 06, South East, Saket Courts, Delhi, has allowed the Respondent's application under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 CPC read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), in the matter titled **SynapseIndia Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. v. Info Edge (India) Ltd.** CS(COMM)NO. 728/2025. The relevant portion of the interim injunction granted reads as under:

"29. Consequently, till further orders, an ad-interim order of injunction is



passed in favour of the Plaintiffs and against the Defendant restraining Defendant from using the trade name of the Plaintiff No.1 i.e. "SynapseIndia" and "SynapseIndia I.T. Outsourcing @ Peace of Mind" on its web-portal i.e. www.ambitionbox.com for inviting/permitting users to post reviews about its work culture or otherwise in respect or in relation to the Plaintiffs. **Time of 72 hours from today** is given to the Defendant for ensuring compliance of the said direction.

30. Further, Plaintiffs are at liberty to file application to the Defendant and/or to the Defendant through Counsel for removal of the comments /posts on the platform of Defendant mentioning the details of the same and Defendant is directed to remove the same **within 36 hours** of receiving the said application from the Plaintiffs."

2. The impugned order was passed in a suit, wherein the Respondents alleged trade mark and copyright infringement, passing off and defamation on account of certain negative reviews posted by users on the Appellant's platform 'AmbitionBox'. The Respondents stated that the Appellant created a page on its platform enabling users to post reviews about the Respondents' company without their express permission, and thus used their trade mark without prior authorisation. It was the stand of the Respondent that Appellant's platform permitted posting of reviews without verification if the 'user, posting the specific content, had actually worked with the company or not. It was contended that the objected to, negative reviews were ex-facie fake and were causing damage to the goodwill and reputation of the Respondent/plaintiffs.

3. However, it is the stand of the Appellant that the Appellant provides a neutral online platform i.e. www.ambitionbox.com, that permits its registered users to post company reviews and salary insights etc. It is a user-driven platform which hosts third-party content in the form of reviews and ratings, and serves as an important source of information for job seekers to



evaluate the work culture, compensation etc. at prospective employer organisation. The Appellant neither initiates, authors, edits, selects the receiver of, modifies nor endorses such content.

3.1. It is stated that the platform of the Appellant does not exercise editorial control over ‘user’ reviews. It publishes and informs the users about its Community Guidelines, Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Further, the Appellant has a multi-tier content review mechanism to take down any content which does not adhere to its Community Guidelines.

3.2. It is stated that the Impugned Order effectively compels the Appellant to apply its own mind to whether the content on its platform should or should not be blocked, proactively screen user content, and publish only “bonafide, identified and factual reviews”.

3.3. It is contended that anonymity on the Appellant’s platform is designed to protect free speech of employees against employers. It is because of this model that several users feel comfortable in speaking up, sometimes to highlight inter alia workplace harassment, favouritism, biasness or pay disparity etc. It is stated that the Trial Court has failed to recognise the fundamental right to free speech of users of the platform. The directions operate as a pre-trial gag order, curtailing speech and criticism in the garb of trade mark protection.

4. Conversely, the Respondent has also, seriously contested that the Appellant is not an intermediary and states that the Appellant is not entitled to safe harbour under Section 79 of the IT Act, 2000. It contends that the impugned order was passed by the Trial Court after reviewing the lack of verification by the Appellant and anonymity of the opinions posted by the



users on this platform.

5. After some arguments, learned counsel for the Appellant states on instructions that Appellant is willing to have the appeal disposed of and suit itself decreed in terms of its undertaking dated 10.04.2026, which reads as under: -

It is humbly submitted that the Impugned Order may be set aside in view of the undertakings herein. Without prejudice to the Appellant's case that the Respondent's suit is misplaced and incorrect, the Appellant is willing to tender the following undertakings:

1. That the Appellant provides a neutral online platform i.e. www.ambitionbox.com that permits its registered users to post company reviews and salary insights etc. The Appellant neither initiates, authors, edits, selects the receiver of, modifies nor endorses such content.
2. As on date, the Appellant allows its users to login either through their Gmail or LinkedIn or Microsoft 365 or Naukri.com account. In addition to the login details, the platform also records IP address and time stamp etc of the users posting reviews. All users accept the terms and conditions that they will not misuse the anonymity of the platform and to respect the community guidelines and the terms and conditions of the platform 'AmbitionBox'.
3. In relation to the Respondents, the Appellant undertakes to use the Respondents' name/ mark only as an identifier to enable its registered users to comment and review the Respondents' company and share salary insight etc. in accordance with the Appellant's terms of use and community guidelines.
4. While the Appellant maintains a robust content review and moderation mechanism which prohibits and removes abusive and other kinds of problematic content (gibberish, not necessarily negative reviews), it is possible that certain at-issue content may get uploaded by the users.
5. In case, the Respondents are aggrieved by any such content, they can reach out to the Appellant at support@ambitionbox.com. The Appellant undertakes to review the reported content within 48 hours on working days and provide an update to the Respondents.
6. Thereafter, the Appellant will immediately remove the content as provided under the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules 2021 (as amended from time to time, in Clause 3(1)(b), if the Respondents furnish any of the following: (a) Court order; or (b) notification by the Appropriate Government or its agency.



7. If the reported content is established on the face of it to be a fake review (for eg: review suggesting that the Respondents maintain a zoo in their office, recorded at para 2(q)(ii) in the Impugned Order at Pg. 83-84/ pdf 93-94, then the Appellants will remove it without requiring a court order.
8. Further, even without a court order, if the reported content reveals confidential information, such as source code, manufacturing techniques, R&D activities, and detailed financial results, the Appellant will remove it within the afore-mentioned timeline.
9. The Appellant requires the reported content to be identified by its URL, by email to the Appellant on support@ambitionbox.com, so as to expeditiously act upon the Respondents' complaint.
10. For any at-issue content, pursuant to an appropriate order by a court of law or a request from a law enforcement agency against the Appellant for a particular post, the Appellant will furnish the user details as maintained by it. This will include the user credentials (used to create the account, IP address, and timestamps).

A copy of the undertaking has been handed over by the learned senior counsel for the Appellant.

6. Learned senior counsel for the Appellant states that the suit may be decreed in terms of the abovementioned undertaking and in case of any breach of terms of this undertaking, the Respondent can have the remedy, to have the same implemented, through execution proceedings.

6.1. She clarifies that with respect to the undertaking, at para no. 10, it is the stand of the Appellant that in respect of the 'at-issue content', which the Appellant refuses to take down and if the Respondent is dissatisfied with the decision of the Appellant, Respondent will be at liberty to approach the Executing Court to raise the issue; and if the Executing Court agrees with the Respondent's grievance and directs the Appellant to provide the user credentials, Appellant shall do so.

6.2. She relies upon Section 72A of the Information and Technology Act, 2000 ('Act of 2000') to contend that if the 'at-issue content' does not fall



foul of Rule 3(1) of the Rules, 2021 and/or the Community Guidelines of the Appellant's platform, the Appellant will not be in a position to either take down the review or provide the user detail information to the Respondent, on its request alone. She states that in such a situation the Respondent may provide a Court order to the Appellant from the Executing Court.

7. Mr. Sehgal, learned counsel for the Respondent states that while Respondent has no objection to the suit being decreed in its favour and against the Appellant in terms and conditions of the undertaking, however, he states that the Respondent is not conceding to the stand of the Appellant that it is an intermediary which is entitled to protection under Section 79 of the Act of 2000. He states that, however, since the suit is being disposed of with consent of the rival parties, the said issue may be left open, so as to not curtail the rights of the Respondent in case any disputes arise in future.

7.1 He states that Respondent should be permitted to respond to the comments posted by the user, without any condition for payment of charges or subscription.

Learned counsel for the Appellant clarifies that the feature to respond is available on the platform without any charges and in fact, in the past Respondent has availed the said facility.

7.2 He submits that the comments on the old page which was taken down by the Appellant in pursuance of the impugned order are no more available and Appellant should not restore the said comments and initiate a fresh page, instead.

Learned counsel for the Appellant states that in compliance with the impugned order it had taken down the page of the Respondent hosted on its



platform and therefore currently no comments are available on its platform. It submits that in view of the order passed today, it will host a fresh page for the Respondent company, not reactivate the old page and therefore the old comments will not be visible.

8. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

9. We have perused the undertakings given by the Appellant and the submissions of the learned counsel for the Appellant, *qua* para no. 10 of the undertaking. The parties have agreed to have the appeal disposed of and the suit decreed in terms of this order.

10. We take the undertakings of the Appellant on record and direct that the Appellant shall remain bound by the said undertakings, the submissions of its senior counsel recorded at paragraph 6.1, 7.1 and 7.2 of this order, as well as the directions issued hereinafter.

11. With respect to 'at-issue content' stipulated at para no. 10 of the undertaking, we clarify that in case the Respondent is aggrieved by the Appellant's stand on 'at-issue content', it will be at liberty to file an appropriate Execution Application to raise the said issue and if the Executing Court finds merit in the submission of the Respondent, it shall issue appropriate directions to the Appellant herein to furnish the user details of the person who published the objected/negative reviews; and thereafter, the Appellant will take action against the said user in accordance with law.

12. In view of the undertakings and the order passed today, the interim injunction order dated 15.01.2026 is therefore, set aside. The Appellant will be at liberty to host a fresh page pertaining to Respondent company and permit posting of user comments *qua* the Respondent. The Appellant will



commence the platform *qua* the Respondent on a clean slate. In case, Respondent has any concerns about the fresh user comments, it will exercise its rights in accordance with terms and conditions set out in this order.

13. With the consent of the parties, the suit itself is decreed in terms of this order. A decree shall be drawn up in favour of the Respondent/plaintiff. The Respondent/plaintiff will be entitled to seek execution of the decree in case of any violation and/or breach by the Appellant/defendant as well as for user credentials in case of an ‘at issue content’.

14. We clarify that since the matter has been settled between the parties through consent, the issue raised by the Respondent/plaintiff in suit seeking a declaration that Appellant/defendant is not an intermediary is left open, and the passing off this decree shall not be construed as issue estoppel against the Respondent/plaintiff, if future disputes arise between parties. The Respondent/plaintiff will be entitled to agitate the said issue in future disputes, which needless to state will be decided in accordance with law.

15. The appeal is hereby disposed of. Pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

16. The Appellant is directed to file an affidavit of its Director and/or authorised representative from Senior Management affirming the undertaking and this order within two (2) weeks. Copy of the board resolution evidencing that this order has been noted by the Board in its minutes and authorised the Director and/or authorised representative to file the affidavit shall be placed along with the said affidavit.

17. The Registry is directed to send this order to the Trial Court via e-mail on the next date of hearing i.e., 15.04.2026 on which date the Trial



2026:DHC:3006-DB



Court will take on record this order and close the proceedings. The Registry of Trial Court is directed to draw up a decree sheet in terms of this order.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

APRIL 10, 2026/mt/IB