



\$~98

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5326/2026**

ANJALI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankur Agnihotri, Mr. Aditya Sharma, Mr. Devanshu, Advs. along with Petitioner-in-person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Gaurav Mishra, CGSC with Ms. Neha Mishra, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. Varun Pathak, Mr. Vishesh Sharma and Ms. Komal Pathak, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

21.04.2026

1. The instant petition is seeking following reliefs:

- “a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to restore the Petitioner’s Instagram account @anjalilohiya07 forthwith;*
- b) Direct the Respondents to provide a reasoned and speaking order specifying the alleged violation;*
- c) Declare the impugned permanent disablement arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution; and*
- d) Award compensation/ damages for violation of fundamental rights and mental harassment caused to the Petitioner;*
- e) Pass any other or further order(s) as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.”*

2. The petitioner seeks for the directions to respondents to restore her Instagram account. The petitioner is a practicing advocate who had an



Instagram account, which was used for socio-political activism. It is stated that on 19.01.2026, the petitioner received an email from respondent no.3, stating that her account has been suspended. The reason for the said suspension is stated to be that her account is not following the Community Standards and account integrity policy of Instagram.

3. The petitioner submits that an endeavor was made to file an appeal, however, the necessary link was not opening and therefore, the petitioner's grievance remains unaddressed.

4. Mr. Varun Pathak, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no. 2, on advance instructions submits that under Rule 3 (2) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (**IT Rules**), there exists a grievance redressal mechanism and the petitioner at the first instance has the remedy to avail the same.

5. Learned counsels for the respondents places reliance on case titled as **Suresh Mansharamani vs. Union of India, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology¹, Through Secretary and Anr.; Ravinder Alias Billu vs. Union of India and Ors.²; Harpreet Kaur vs. Union of India and Ors.³**; and the Division Bench decisions titled as **T.V. Today Network Limited and Anr. vs. Union of India and Ors.⁴** and in LPA titled as **Ravinder vs. Union of India⁵**.

6. In view of the aforesaid, liberty is granted to the petitioner to file appropriate application for her grievance redressal in terms of Rule 3 (2) of

¹ W.P.(C) 9421/2022 decision dated 30.01.2024

² W.P.(C) 21/2025 decision dated 15.01.2025

³ W.P.(C) 2597/2026 decision dated 24.02.2026

⁴ W.P.(C) 4912/2024 date of decision 01.05.2024

⁵ LPA 35/2025 decision dated 15.01.2025



the IT Rules.

7. If the petitioner, thereafter, has any grievance, she shall be at liberty to avail further remedy as available under the scheme of IT Rules.

8. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 21, 2026/SH