



\$~51

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

+ **CS(OS) 353/2025**

PUSHKAR RAJ THAKUR

....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Samrat Nigam, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Himanshu Goyal, Ms. Muskan Garg, Ms.
Sanskriti Chandna and Ms. Arpita Rawat,
Advocates.

versus

GOOGLE LLC AND ANR.

....Defendants

Through: Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Mr. Rohan
Ahuja, Ms. Shruttima Ehersa and Ms. Devangini
Rai, Advocates for D-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

27.05.2025

I.A. 13510/2025

1. This is an application preferred on behalf of the Plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing complete address and particulars of Defendant No. 2.
2. Complete address and particulars of Defendant No. 2 shall be furnished by the Plaintiff within a period of one week from today.
3. Application stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 353/2025

4. Let plaint be registered as a suit.
5. Issue summons.
6. Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, learned counsel accepts summons on behalf of Defendant No. 1.



7. Written statement shall be filed by Defendant No. 1 within 30 days from today along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.
8. It is open to the Plaintiff to file replication within 30 days from receipt of the written statement along with affidavit of admission/denial of documents filed by Defendant No. 1.
9. Upon filing of process fee and complete address along with other particulars of Defendant No.2, issue summons to Defendant No. 2, through all permissible modes, returnable before the Joint Registrar on 03.09.2025.
10. Written statement shall be filed by Defendant No. 2 within 30 days from the receipt of summons along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.
11. It is open to the Plaintiff to file replication within 30 days from receipt of the written statement along with affidavit of admission/denial of documents filed by Defendant No. 2.
12. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.
13. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same be done in accordance with Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.
14. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of service and pleadings, marking of exhibits and admission/denial of documents on 03.09.2025.

I.A. 13509/2025

15. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiff for an *ex parte ad interim* injunction seeking the following reliefs:-



“a) Direct Defendant No. 1 and 2 to immediately remove, take down, block access and prevent circulation of the following:

Video dated 10.01.2025: "EXPOSED! How Influencer Gurus' Are Ripping You Off | Course Scams";

Video dated 14.01.2025: "EXPOSED! Pushkar Raj Thakur's Shocking Copyright Strike";

YouTube Shorts dated 29.01.2025: "The DARK TRUTH Behind Pushkar Raj Thakur's Deleted Video?";

Video dated 17.05.2025: "Exposing Pushkar Raj Thakur: Fake Guru or Master Scammer?"

b) Restrain the Defendants from uploading or allowing to upload any new defamatory content targeting the Plaintiff till final disposal of the suit;

c) Grant an ex-parte ad-interim injunction in favour of the Plaintiff and against Defendant No. 2, his agents, associates, representatives or anyone acting on his behalf in terms of prayer clauses (1) and (2) hereinabove;”

16. Issue notice.

17. Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of Defendant No. 1.

18. On taking steps, notice be issued to Defendant No. 2, through all permissible modes, returnable before Court on 14.10.2025.

19. Learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff submits that Plaintiff is a highly acclaimed financial educator, business coach and entrepreneur, who has carved out a niche in the digital and public domain through years of professional engagement. He commands a significant digital presence, having over 1.3 crore subscribers on YouTube and a substantial audience on other social media platforms. Plaintiff has established a formidable reputation and image for himself in the society.

20. It is urged that Defendant No. 2 is a YouTube content creator who operates under the YouTube handle ‘DECLUTTER’. He has launched an orchestrated and malicious online defamation campaign specifically



targeting the Plaintiff and has uploaded multiple defamatory videos on 10.01.2025, 14.01.2025, 29.01.2025 and 17.05.2025 respectively, which can be found on the following URLs:-

VIDEOS	URLs
“EXPOSED! How "Influencer Gurus" Are Ripping You Off Course Scams”	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uIbuyNUxOqQ
“EXPOSED! Pushkar Raj Thakur's Shocking Copyright Strike”	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YzafmJF14kQ
“The DARK TRUTH Behind Pushkar Raj Thakur's Deleted Video?”	https://www.youtube.com/shorts/azE2hwAyHIA
“Exposing Pushkar Raj Thakur: Fake Guru or Master Scammer?”	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-RBMPoZHbU

21. It is urged by learned Senior Counsel that the defamatory and derogatory videos are replete with false accusations, mischaracterisation, personal insinuations and attacks with an intent to malign Plaintiff’s character. Objective of Defendant No. 2 is to exploit Plaintiff’s popularity to



boost his own digital reach, subscribers and revenue at the expense of Plaintiff's standing and large subscriber base, brand element etc. In the first video, Defendant No. 2 made numerous defamatory claims, which are self-evident from the video itself. Defendant No. 2 falsely accuses the Plaintiff of operating a massive financial scam, using testimonials and manipulative success stories to extract money from unsuspecting followers. In one of the videos, Plaintiff is referred to as a Master Scammer claiming to be an exposure of Plaintiff's real business.

22. Court has heard learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff and perused the screenshots of the videos as also the transcripts and translations thereof, filed with the plaint. In my *prima facie* view, the videos are defamatory and do impinge on the reputation of the Plaintiff. Plaintiff avers that after the first video was reported by the Plaintiff, it was removed from YouTube by Defendant No. 1 but Defendant No. 2 again uploaded the defamatory videos, which *prima facie* does indicate an orchestrated campaign to malign the Plaintiff. There can be no doubt that dignity of an individual must be protected and a balance be maintained between freedom of speech and individual's dignity.

23. Plaintiff has made out a *prima facie* case for grant of interim injunction and balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiff. If the aforesaid videos are permitted to circulate, irreparable harm shall be caused to Plaintiff's reputation.

24. It is accordingly directed that Defendant No. 2, his associates, servants, agents, affiliates, assigns, employees or any one acting on his behalf shall not create, publish, upload, share or disseminate defamatory videos against the Plaintiff, in any manner whatsoever, till the next date of



hearing. Defendant No. 2 is further directed to take down the aforementioned four videos and/or any other video that is currently uploaded on the YouTube and/or is in circulation on any social media platform, within a period of two days from today. In case, Defendant No. 2 does not take down the defamatory videos from the YouTube channel, Plaintiff will be at liberty to report the same to Defendant No. 1 and on receipt of such intimation, Defendant No. 1 will bring down the videos within 48 hours.

25. Plaintiff shall comply with provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC *qua* Defendant No. 2 within a period of two days from today.

JYOTI SINGH, J

MAY 27, 2025/shivam