



\$~95

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4651/2026**

SHILPA KUMARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Apar Gupta, Dr Divya Swamy,
Mr. Rishav Ranjan, Mr. Naman
Kumar, Mr. Aman Prasad and Ms.
Ananya Y, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy,
CGSC with Ms. Usha Jamnal, Ms.
Nyasa Sharma and Mr. Ankit Khatri,
Advs. for UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

08.04.2026

CM APPL. 22675/2026 (EXEMPTION)

CM APPL. 22676/2026 (EXEMPTION)

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

W.P.(C) 4651/2026 and CM APPL. 22674/2026

3. The instant petition has been filed seeking following reliefs:

“A. Issue writ of Mandamus, or a direction to Respondent No. 1 & 2 to restore Petitioner’s Facebook page ‘Karishma Ki Report’ within the territory of India;



B. Issue a writ, direction, or order to ensure that any censorship on social media is carried out strictly in accordance with provisions of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the Rules framed thereunder, namely the 8 & 9 of the Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009 and in conformity with the fundamental rights and freedom guaranteed under Article 14, 19(1)(a) and 21 under Part III of the Indian Constitution, insofar as the same pertains to the Petitioner;

C. Issue a writ, direction or order Respondent No.1 to produce Blocking Order issued under Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 along with all supporting material before this Hon'ble Court; and/or D. Issue writ of Declaration that account restriction without following principles of natural justice is unconstitutional and illegal and hence liable for compensation; E. Issue writ of declaration that misuse and arbitrary action under Rule 3 (1) (d) of IT Rules 2021 & Section 79 (3) (b) is unconstitutional and illegal.”

4. The petitioner claims to operate a Facebook page titled “Karishma Ki Report”. The said page seems to have been blocked across India since November 2025.

5. The petitioner undertakes to remove/delete all objectionable material, subject to reserving her right to contest before the appropriate authority. It, however, is submitted that the blocking be lifted. The petitioner places reliance on directions passed by this Court in ***Prateek Sharma vs. Union of India and Ors***¹ and ***Kumar Nayan vs. Union of India & Anr***,² whereby similar facts and circumstances were dealt with.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the concerned Ministry, on instructions, submits that the Designated Officer received a request from the Nodal Officer, as designated under Rule 4 of the Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access of Information by Public Rules, 2009 (**“Blocking**

¹ W.P.(C) 4070/2026, Order dated 06.04.2026.

² W.P.(C) 4377/2026, Order dated 06.04.2026.



Rules”), for blocking of the content being disseminated through the petitioner’s Facebook page. The counsel further submits that upon receipt of such request, the Designated Officer passed the blocking order, as empowered by Rule 5 of the Blocking Rules. It is submitted that the said order was passed on the grounds that the content posted on the petitioner’s Facebook page was found to contain emotionally charged religious slogans, aimed at exploiting religious feelings.

7. It is, however, submitted that the Ministry is ready and willing to afford a personal hearing to the petitioner, i.e., Ms. Shilpa Kumari, after due verification of her identity. It is also submitted that the lifting of the blocking shall be considered based on such hearing.

8. Having considered the submissions made by the parties and in view of the undertaking being placed on record by the petitioner, the Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the instant writ petition with the following directions:

- i. Let the petitioner be informed about the necessary documents required for her identity verification.
- ii. The petitioner to immediately respond back to the communication received by the respondent within three days. On due satisfaction, let the petitioner be called in person within seven days.
- iii. Let the Committee, as envisaged under Rule 7 of the Blocking Rules, extend an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.
- iv. The petitioner shall be informed as to the specific content that is, according to the Ministry, objectionable or forms the genesis for the impugned action.
- v. On furnishing the undertaking by the petitioner, let the



necessary communication be made to the intermediary for temporary blocking of the said objectionable material but to allow the petitioner to operate her Facebook account.

vi. Let the Committee to pass a reasoned order as to why it considers the said material to be objectionable and upon receipt of such order, the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the Review Committee.

vii. The liberty is also granted to the respondent to monitor the material posted on the petitioner's social media platform and in case any objectionable material is found in the future, the ministry shall be at liberty to take applicable recourse in accordance with law.

9. The instant petition, along with the pending application, stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 8, 2026/Sh