



\$~121

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2597/2026**

Date of Decision: **24.02.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

HARPREET KAUR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yatin Sharma and Mr. Mohit solanki Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukul Singh (CGSC), Mr. Adhiraj Singh (GP), Mr. Aryan Dhaka, Advocate for R-1 and 5.
Ms Mamta Jha, Mr Rohan Ahuja, Ms Shruttima Ehersa, Ms Aiswarya Debadarshini, Advocates for R-3.
Mr. Varun Pathak, Ms. Ameer Rana, Mr. Vishesh Sharma, Ms. Bhavnish Kaur, Advocates for R-4.
Mr Manashwy Jha, adv panel counsel civil GNCTD for R-8.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR

SHARMA

Signing Date:28.02.2026

13:00:44

W.P.(C) 2597/2026

Page 1 of 3

Signature Not Verified

Signed
By:PURUSHAINDRA
KUMAR KAURAV



CM APPL. 12653/2026 (EXEMPTION)

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

W.P.(C) 2597/2026

3. The petitioner seeks for the following reliefs:

“(a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order or Direction directing Respondent No.1 to immediately initiate strict regulatory and penal action against Respondent No.2 for operating as an illegal digital news publisher without registration or licence in violation of Rule 18 of the IT Rules 2021 and the Code of Ethics prescribed under Rule 9;

(b) Direct Respondent No.1 to immediately block and prohibit Respondent No.2 from operating as a digital news publisher and direct Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to immediately remove the impugned defamatory video and permanently shut down all social media accounts of Respondent No.2;

(c) Direct Respondent No.1 to take strict action against Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 for violating their statutory obligations under Section 79 of the IT Act 2000 and IT Rules 2021 by allowing Respondent No.2 to operate without verification and for hosting defamatory content;

(d) Direct Respondent No.5 to initiate strict and appropriate legal action against Respondent No.2, Mr. Manish and all other persons found involved, in accordance with law, and to ensure that a fair, impartial and time-bound inquiry/investigation is conducted so that the unlawful acts complained of by the Petitioner are duly addressed in the interest of justice;

(e) Direct Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to immediately and permanently ban, close, suspend, terminate and deactivate the YouTube channel, Facebook account, Instagram account and all other social media accounts and handles operated by Respondent No.2 under the name "Delhi Samachar TV" or any similar name;

(f) Direct Respondent No.6 to take appropriate administrative action against Respondent No.2 under Section 98 of BNSS 2023 for forfeiture of defamatory publications;

(g) Issue directions to Respondent No.2 to pay adequate compensation to the Petitioner for grave harm, mental trauma and violation of fundamental rights;

(h) Pass any other order or direction that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”

Signature Not Verified

Signed By:AMIT KUMAR
SHARMA
Signing Date:28.02.2026
13:00:44

W.P.(C) 2597/2026

Page 2 of 3

Signature Not Verified

Signed
By:PURUSHAINDR
KUMAR KAURAV



4. The essential grievance of the petitioner is qua respondent no.2 who is purportedly operating a digital news channel and is allegedly publishing a defamatory video on Youtube, Facebook and Instagram falsely implicating the petitioner. Respondent no.2 is a private entity.

5. The writ court, in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is neither intended nor equipped to embark upon an adjudicatory inquiry into seriously disputed questions of fact or to pronounce upon the veracity of the contested allegations advanced by the petitioner. The proper remedy for the petitioner is to file a civil suit for injunction and damages. So far as the grievance with respect to official respondents is concerned, the petitioner will have to take the recourse under the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021. A similar view has been taken by this Court in *Uday Ratra v. Union of India*.¹

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

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 24, 2026/aks/ap.

¹ Order dated 21.01.2026 in W. P. (C) 821/2026.