



\$~50

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

+ **W.P.(C) 14650/2024 and CM APPL. 61488/2024**

BOORGULA MEHER THEJ MEHAR TEJ .....Petitioner

Through: Mr Arjun Singh Bawa and Mr.  
Siddhartha, Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. ....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anubhav Gupta, Panel Counsel,  
Civil, GNCTD.  
Mr. Mukul Singh, CGSC with Mr.  
Aryan Dhaka, Advocate for R-UOI.  
Mr. Gaurav Dhama and Ms. Sushree  
Sipra, Advs. for R-2.  
Ms. Mamta, Mr. Rohan, Ms.  
Shrutima, Ms. Amishi, Ms.  
Aishwarya, Ms. Diya and Ms.  
Jahanvi, Advs. for R-5  
Mr. Sahil, Advocate for R-7.  
Mr. Nirmal Mishra and Ms.  
Naisargika, Advocate for R-11.  
Mr. Ashish Verma, Mr. Akhil R.,  
Advocates for R-8  
Mr. Nital Hinduja, Advocate for R-  
17.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **15.04.2026**

1. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties,  
as of now, there does not seem to be any binding policy requiring the



respondents to mask/ remove/ redact/ delist/ delete the name of the petitioner from the digital records of the case concerning the allegation from which the petitioner has been absolved. It be noted, however, that the petitioner has been acquitted.

2. In absence of any binding policy, the Court is unable to accede to the prayer made in the instant petition.

3. It is also pointed out that almost a similar dispute is pending for consideration before the Supreme Court in ***Ikanoon Software Development Pvt. Ltd. v. Karthick Theodore***.<sup>1</sup>

4. Needless to state that if after pronouncement of the judgment by the Supreme Court, the petitioner's grievance is not fully mitigated, it shall be at liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

5. With the aforesaid observations and liberty, the instant petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**APRIL 15, 2026**

**Nc**

---

<sup>1</sup> SLP No. 15311/2024.