



2026:DHC:5338



\$~34

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

%

Date of Decision : 02.07.2026+ **W.P.(C) 8465/2026**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Munawwar Naseem,
Advocate with Mr. Rajendra
Prasad, Mr. Keethi Kumar,
Ms. Manisha Dubey &
Ms. Raksha Sharma,
Advocates.

versus

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rohan Ahuja, Ms.
Shruttima Ehersa, Ms. Jahanvi
Agarwal, Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Anil Panwar, SPC with
Ms. Disha Choudhary, GP, Mr.
Nikhil Goel, Ms. Sahej
Sawhney, Advocates for R-5. .

CORAM:**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA****JUDGMENT****SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J (ORAL)**

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner prays for grant of following reliefs:

“a) A writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction be issued commanding Respondent Nos. 1



to 4 (Google LLC, Google India Private Limited, and YouTube LLC and twitter/x) to forthwith remove, delete, de-index and disable access to all videos, content, articles, URLs and related digital content pertaining to the Petitioner's matrimonial dispute as specifically enumerated in Annexure P-1 hereto;

b) Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 be directed to permanently de-index from Google Search results all URLs, links, web pages and content relating to the Petitioner's settled matrimonial dispute;

c) Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 be directed to employ hash-matching technology and other automated tools to prevent re-uploading or republication of the impugned content;

d) Respondent Nos. 1-4 be directed to refrain from publishing, broadcasting, uploading, hosting, displaying, sharing or otherwise disseminating any content relating to the Petitioner's settled matrimonial matters;

e) Costs of this petition be awarded to the Petitioner;

f) Pass such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem t and proper in the interest of justice, equity and good conscience..."

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a serving Indian Police Service (IPS) officer who had a matrimonial dispute with his wife. However, the said dispute has since been amicably settled and the FIR, which had been registered on the complaint of the wife, also stands quashed by the High Court of Telangana in the year 2024 on the basis of compromise. It is, however, submitted that the petitioner has noticed that several news channels have published online news reports sensationalising the said matrimonial dispute and disclosing the identity of the petitioner as an IPS trainee, in a manner prejudicial to his reputation. He has, inter alia, sought the removal and de-indexing of all such news articles. It is further submitted that respondent no. 1 (Google LLC) and



2026:DHC:5338



respondent no. 3 (YouTube LLC) are situated within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court and that the petitioner had also sent a formal notice to them seeking the aforesaid reliefs. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner seeks to enforce his right to privacy under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and that the impugned news articles are available and accessible throughout the country, including in Delhi. Therefore, according to him, this Court has territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present petition. In this regard, reliance has also been placed on the recent decision of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in a batch of petitions, the lead matter being *Laksh Vir Singh Yadav v. Union of India & Ors.*: 2026:DHC:4891, wherein the Coordinate Bench held that the ‘right to be forgotten’ forms a part of the right to privacy under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and laid down a framework enabling individuals, particularly those who have been acquitted, discharged, or whose disputes have been settled, to seek removal, masking or de-indexing of their names from digitised court records and search engine results.

3. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 1 submits that the petitioner is a resident of Telangana and that all the news articles referred to in the present petition are in the Telugu language and have been published by Telugu news channels. It is, therefore, contended that the substantial part of the cause of action has arisen within the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court of Telangana and, consequently, the petitioner ought to be relegated to the said High Court.



2026:DHC:5338



4. This Court has **heard** submissions advanced by the learned counsels for the parties, and has perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner, a serving IPS officer, has approached this Court seeking removal, deletion and de-indexing of online news reports and other digital content pertaining to his matrimonial dispute, which has since been settled and the related criminal proceedings quashed, on the ground that the continued publication of such content infringes his right to privacy and reputation under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Concededly, respondent no. 1, Google LLC, the Resident Grievance Officer of respondent no. 3 YouTube LLC, and the concerned Union Ministry, i.e. the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), are situated within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. The petitioner had also addressed formal notices to Google LLC and MeitY seeking deletion and de-indexing of the impugned links.

7. It is further pertinent to note that the news channels which had published the articles relating to the petitioner and his matrimonial dispute, including the Telugu news channels, have not been impleaded as parties to the present petition. This is so because the petitioner is not seeking any relief against the individual publishers of the news reports. Rather, the relief sought is a consolidated one against the respondent intermediaries and authorities, i.e. Google, YouTube, Twitter/X and MeitY, for removal, deletion, de-indexing



2026:DHC:5338



and disabling access to all videos, content, articles, URLs and related digital content pertaining to his matrimonial dispute.

8. It is also a matter of record that the impugned articles are not confined to reports published in the Telugu language. Several reports have also been published in English by national media houses, including Times of India, The Hindu, NDTV and News18, and are accessible and readable throughout the country, including within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

9. Therefore, it cannot be said that no part of the cause of action has arisen within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

10. In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that it possesses the territorial jurisdiction to entertain the present petition.

11. In view of the aforesaid, on petitioner taking steps, issue notice to the respondents through all modes, including electronically. Let the counter affidavit(s) be filed within three weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

12. List on 21.08.2026.

13. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

JULY 02, 2026/ns