



\$~42

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

+ **CS(OS) 318/2026**

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar, Senior Advocate,
Mrs. Rebecca John, Senior Advocate,
Mr. Prashanto Chandra Sen, Senior
Advocate along with Mr. Gaurav
Gupta, Mr. Sarim Naved, Mr. Abhik
Chimni, Mr. Kapil Madan, Mr. Omar
Hoda, Mr. Jaspal Singh, Ms. Namrah
Nasir, Ms. Eesha Bakshi, Mr. Uday
Bhatia, Mr. Kamran Khan, Mr. Surya
Kiran Singh, Ms. Ayesha Khan, Mr.
Aviral Jain, Ms. Manjira Dasgupta,
Mr. Prabhav Bahuguna, Mr. Naman
Maheswari, Mr. Utkarsh Trivedi, Mr.
Rupal Gupta, Ms. Shambhavi Khare
and Mr. Nilanjan, Advocates

versus

X CORP AND ORS

.....Defendants

Through:

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD**

ORDER

%

15.04.2026

**THIS MATTER HAS BEEN HEARD THROUGH VIDEO-
CONFERRING**

**CS(OS) 318/2026 & I.A. 9954/2026, I.A. 9955/2026, I.A. 9956/2026, I.A.
9957/2026**

1. The present Suit is one for permanent and mandatory injunction,
along with damages, seeking restraint against Defendants No. 2 to 4 from
publishing or circulating defamatory content, and a direction to Defendant

CS(OS) 318/2026

Page 1 of 6



No.1 to take down such content, disclose identities of anonymous perpetrators, and prevent further dissemination of defamatory material targeting the Plaintiffs.

2. Plaintiff No.1 is an advocate practicing before the Supreme Court of India for nearly two decades. Plaintiff No.2 is also an advocate with significant experience in public policy, including service with the Government of the United Kingdom, and was associated with Meta India's public policy team (focusing on online women and child safety policy) until her resignation on 20.01.2026. It is stated that the Plaintiffs are a married couple and experienced legal professionals of established standing.

3. Defendant No.1 is X Corp., which is the company operating the platform X (formerly Twitter). Defendants No.2 and 3 are anonymous social media accounts operating on Defendant No.1's platform under the handles "@Jhunjhunuwala_" and "@mujifren", respectively, whose real identities remain undisclosed and who claim affiliation with an organisation styled as ISSF. Defendant No.4 is a John Doe entity representing unknown persons, including bots and coordinated troll accounts, acting in concert with Defendant Nos.2 and 3 to publish and amplify defamatory content against the Plaintiffs.

4. Let the Plaint be registered as a suit.

5. Issue summons to the Defendants, to be served through all permissible modes, including *Dasti*.

6. The summons to the Defendants shall indicate that the Written Statement(s) to the plaint shall be positively filed within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of summons. Along with the Written Statement(s), the Defendants shall also file the affidavit(s) of admission/denial of the documents of the Plaintiffs, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not



be taken on record.

7. Liberty is given to the Plaintiffs to file the Replication(s) within a period of 30 days of the receipt of the Written Statement(s). Along with the Replication, if any, filed by the Plaintiffs, the affidavit(s) of admission/denial of documents of the defendant(s) shall be filed by the Plaintiff, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

8. List before the Joint Registrar on 28.05.2026.

I.A. 9953/2026

9. The instant Application has been filed by the Plaintiffs under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 [“CPC”], has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiffs for *ex parte* ad interim injunction restraining the Defendants, their agents, associates or any person acting on their behalf from publishing, reposting, circulating or in any manner disseminating any defamatory, false, misleading, communally provocative or derogatory content concerning the Plaintiffs.

10. A prayer has also been made to direct Defendants No. 2 to 4 to immediately remove/delete/take down the impugned posts, tweets and related content concerning the Plaintiff from the platform X (formerly Twitter) and any other platform where the same has been published or shared.

11. The Plaintiffs have also prayed for issuance of directions to Defendant No.1 to take down, disable access to and prevent further dissemination of the impugned content and any identical or similar content relating to the Plaintiff, preserve all records, including account details, IP logs, metadata and related information pertaining to the impugned handles and restrain the Defendants from creating, publishing or circulating any identical or



substantially similar defamatory content during the pendency of the present suit.

12. It is the case of the Plaintiffs that an urgent interim relief is necessitated due to the continuous, deliberate, escalating and coordinated pattern of defamatory, malicious, false and communally inflammatory conduct on part of the Defendants No. 2 to 4, who have been publishing, reposting and amplifying unlawful content against the Plaintiffs on social media platforms. According to the Plaintiffs, this malicious and *per se* defamatory content has caused and continues to cause grave and irreparable harm to her reputation, dignity and professional standing and exposing her to sustained public hostility, harassment and targeted abuse.

13. The Plaintiffs assert that the continuous series of content circulating on social media against them is also communally provocative, attributes baseless professional misconduct, bias and unlawful conduct to the Plaintiffs – all the while making gratuitous and inflammatory references to their personal life with the intent to provoke prejudice, hatred and targeted harassment. For *inter alia* these reasons, the Plaintiffs contend that the impugned content being published by the Defendants No. 2 to 4 is *ex facie* defamatory, false and devoid of any factual basis.

14. It is well settled that for grant of interim injunction, three ingredients have to be made out, namely, *prima facie* case, balance of convenience and irreparable injury which cannot be compensated in terms of money.

15. In matters of grant of injunction, against publication of any article where right of freedom of speech is impeached, the Courts must take into account the nature of publication and its impact on the lives of the Petitioner/Plaintiff claiming injunction.



16. This Court has gone through the tweets. In the opinion of this Court, the tweets are communally provocative, profane and vulgar in nature which affects the dignity and personal lives of the Plaintiffs. The content of the tweets are extremely derogatory and no human being with dignity and self-respect can live peacefully and with head held high if such scandalous, vulgar posts are circulated against them amongst the public at large.

17. A perusal of the tweets reveals that a substantial amount of content includes statements that can be construed as communally inflammatory. References have been made to the personal lives of the Plaintiffs in the context of their political inclinations, which indicates a brewing campaign by those who have opposing political inclinations.

18. What particularly worries this Court is a perusal of Document No. 5, which contains a compilation of comments, some of which contain threats of physical and sexual violence. All of these posts have been gathering widespread attention from the general public, which is also attributable to the language used in the impugned content, which in the *prima facie* opinion of this Court, have been written in a way to garner more and more attention.

19. It is well settled that reputation is an integral part of the dignity of each individual and there is a need to balance between freedom of speech and freedom of expression *vis-a-vis* the right to reputation which has been considered as a part of the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

20. Continuous circulation of the impugned content is likely to cause harm to the reputation and career of the Plaintiffs and if not taken down immediately, such loss to reputation would not be capable of being compensated monetarily. Balance of convenience also lies in restraining the Defendants No. 2 to 4 in uploading the same content on any other social



media platforms and directing the Defendants to bring down the impugned content uploaded at the links as mentioned in document at Serial No. 7 of the Plaintiffs' Documents filed along with the Plaint.

21. Accordingly, the Defendants, their agents, associates or any person acting on their behalf are restrained from publishing, reposting, circulating or in any manner disseminating any defamatory, false, misleading, communally provocative or derogatory content concerning the Plaintiffs.

22. Further, the Defendants No. 2 to 4 are directed to remove/delete/take down the impugned posts, tweets and related content concerning the Plaintiff from the platform X (formerly Twitter) and any other platform where the same has been published or shared before, within three (3) days from the date of upload of this Order.

23. The Defendant No.1 is also directed to take down, disable access to and prevent further dissemination of the impugned content and any identical or similar content relating to the Plaintiffs.

24. Any member of the public is also restrained from uploading the very same content on any social media platforms till the next date of hearing.

25. Let compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the CPC be made within four (4) days from today.

26. List on 17.07.2026.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

APRIL 15, 2026

Rahul/AP