



2026:DHC:4161



\$~95

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4613/2026 & CM APPL. 22503/2026**

Date of Decision: **05.05.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

SANJAY SHARMA AND ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr Akhil Sibal, Sr Adv with Mr S M Haider Rizvi, Mr Talha Abdul Rahman, Ms Jahnvi Sindhu, Mr Sudhanshu Tewari, Mr Krishnesh Bapat, Mr Faizan Ahmed, Mr Shuktiz Sinha, Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC, Mr. R V Prabhat Mr. Amit Gupta, Mr. Shubham Sharma, Mr. Yash Wardhan Sharma, Mr. Naman, Advs.
Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Mr. Rohan Ahuja, Ms. Shruttima Ehersa, Ms. Aiswarya Debardarshini, Mr. Ankit Tripathi, Ms. Jahanvi Agarwal, Advs.
for R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition is filed for the following reliefs:



“a) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, to call for records relating to Blocking of the Petitioner’s YouTube Channel “4PM” and quash and set aside the impugned blocking order issued by Respondent No.1 directing Respondent No.4 to block access to the Petitioner’s YouTube Channel “4 PM” in India;

b) Issue a writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to restore forthwith public access in India to the Petitioner’s YouTube Channel “4 PM” and all content therein

c) Pass such other and further orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interests of justice, equity and good conscience.”

2. The petitioners seek the restoration of its YouTube Channel ‘4PM’; and the production as also the quashing of the blocking order issued by respondent no. 1 to respondent no. 4-YouTube India (“**YouTub**e”). It is stated that the petitioner’s YouTube channel 4PM, prior to its blocking had 83 Lakhs subscribers and a viewership of 1.45 crores views monthly.

3. The facts appear to be that on 12.03.2026, 8:00 AM, the petitioners received an Email from YouTube stating that it has received a direction from respondent no. 2 - Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (“**MeitY**”) to block the petitioners’ YouTube Channel 4 PM in pursuance of Rule 16(2) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (“**Intermediary Rules**”).

4. On 12.03.2026, 8:51 AM, the petitioners received an Email from YouTube informing the former that it had received an order from the government “*related to national security or public order regarding your content*”, and resultantly the 4PM channel is being blocked. It is contended that, thereafter, on 12.03.2026, 8:52 AM, 27 emails were received from YouTube, whereby it was informed that 27 videos on the 4PM YouTube channel are being blocked.



2026:DHC:4161



5. On the same day *vide* email dated 12.03.2026 at 11:55 AM, the petitioners were informed that a meeting of the Inter-Departmental Committee constituted under the Intermediary Rules had been scheduled on 13.03.2026 at 5 PM for consideration of blocking of the petitioners' channel. Thereafter, various exchanges took places, rescheduling the hearing, and ultimately on 18.03.2026, the petitioners were granted an opportunity of hearing, and their written submissions were also taken on record. It is contended that the final order dated 24.03.2026 passed by the Inter-Departmental Committee was not communicated.

6. Mr. Akhil Sibal, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners, submit that the reason for blocking as also the blocking order has not been provided to them, therefore, the petitioners are unable to exercise their rights to defend the concerned themselves before the concerned authority.

7. During the course of submissions, the action of the respondent has been justified by Mr. Chetan Sharma, learned ASG, who contends that the IDC has already passed the order dated 24.03.2026 and has taken note of the content of the material and found that the same should not be allowed to be viewed by the public at large. He, therefore, contends that the channel has rightly been blocked.

8. Mr. Sharma has also pointed out from his written note that there are prior instances which would reflect that the petitioners are in breach of the mandatory requirements provided for under various rules and regulations. He has also explained the scheme of the Act and the rules, and submitted that the content was detrimental to India's national security, sovereignty and public order.

9. The Court, however, finds that the petitioner had posted on its account



2026:DHC:4161



approximately 50 thousand videos and a fraction of them i.e., 26 were found to be objectionable/offending. It is also seen that under almost similar circumstances, the Court in the case of *Prateek Sharma v. Union of India & Ors.*,¹ *Kumar Nayan v. Union of India & Anr.*² and *Shilpa Kumari vs. Union of India & Ors.*³ and *Sandeep Singh v. Union of India & Anr.*,⁴ have disposed of the writ petitions granting liberty to the petitioner to agitate their *lis* before the IDC, while allowing the respective channel/account to operate, subject to further orders to be passed by the IDC.

10. Having considered the overall conspectus of the facts and situations, and without entering into the legal issues raised in the writ petition, the Court finds that the instant petition can be disposed of by balancing the equities, and issuing the following directions:

- i. Let the petitioners to appear before the IDC on the date and time to be fixed by the said committee;
- ii. On the petitioners' appearance, let the IDC to point out the alleged objectionable/offending material posted by the petitioner on his YouTube channel. If the petitioner seeks time to explain/justify the same, let sufficient time be granted to the petitioner;
- iii. Let YouTube to temporarily block/suspend the alleged objectionable/offending videos on the petitioners' YouTube Channel, and upon compliance of the same, let the petitioners' YouTube channel be restored;
- iv. Let further action concerning the *lis*, as also the objectionable

¹ W.P. (C) 4070 of 2026; order dated 06.04.2026

² W.P. (C) 4377 of 2026; order dated 06.04.2026

³ W.P. (C) 4651 of 2026; order dated 08.04.2026

⁴ W.P. (C) 4696 of 2026; order dated 13.04.2026



2026:DHC:4161



material, be subject to the final adjudication and order to be passed by the IDC and/or the appropriate authority;

- v. The recommendations by the IDC, if any, pertaining to the order to be passed by the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, be supplied to the petitioners; and
 - vi. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting shall be at liberty to monitor the material posted on the petitioners' YouTube channel and in case, any further objectionable/offending material is posted, it shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
11. With these observations, the petition stands disposed of.
 12. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 5, 2026/p