

\$~6

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

+ W.P.(C) 7654/2020 & CM APPLs. 25326-25327/2020

TARUN CHANDIOK

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rakesh Tiku, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Uday Gupta, Ms. Shivani M. Lal, Mr. Hiren  
Dasan, Mr. Ram Bhakt Aggarwal, Mr. M. K.  
Tripathi, Mr. Chand Qureshi, Advocates

Versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Kirtiman Singh, CGSC with  
Mr. Waize Ali Noor, Mr. Rohan Anand, Adv. for  
UI

Mr. Ramesh Singh, Standing Counsel for GNCTD

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN**

**ORDER**

%

**08.10.2020**

The proceedings in the matter have been conducted through video conferencing.

1. This public interest litigation has been preferred with the following prayers:-

*“a. issue a direction, order or writ, including a writ in the nature of mandamus against the Respondents thereby, enjoining them to interdict access of internet content involving websites and mobile application (“apps”) facilitating proscribed “gaming”, whether in the name of online fantasy gaming or skill monetization or game of skill, within the meaning of the Public Gambling Act,*

*1867 and the Delhi Public Gambling Act, 1955; and*

*b. issue a direction, order or writ, including a writ in the nature of mandamus against the Respondents thereby directing them to restrain broadcasters, television channels, radio, internet companies, etc. from running advertisements, campaigns, endorsements, promotional features, etc. apropos of such illegally run gaming websites and/or mobile applications insofar as it offends the provisions of the Public Gambling Act, 1867 and the Delhi Public Gambling Act, 1955; and*

*c. issue a direction, order or writ, including a writ in the nature of mandamus against the Respondents thereby, directing them to initiate apposite penal action consistent with offences envisaged under the provisions of the Public Gambling Act, 1867 and the Delhi Public Gambling Act, 1955 against the violators/offenders; and*

*d. issue a direction, order or writ, including a writ in the nature of mandamus against the Respondents thereby, directing them to formulate a policy and constitute a Gaming Commission as much in order to comprehensively regulate and redress the grievances of online players as to guard the interests of minor children and impressionable youth up to a certain age from the long shadow such engagement is well known to cast;and/or*

*e. pass such further and/or other order(s) as this Court deems fit and expedient in the facts and circumstances of the captioned case.”*

2. Having heard learned counsel for both the sides and looking to the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that earlier also we have disposed of a petition of similar nature, i.e. W.P.(C)

No.5661/2019 vide our order dated 28.11.2019, we hereby direct the respondents to treat this petition as a representation and decide the grievances ventilated in this petition, as narrated in detail in this writ petition.

3. The respondents shall decide the representation in accordance with law, rules, regulations and government policies applicable to the facts of the case, as early as possible and practicable.

4. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**PRATEEK JALAN, J**

OCTOBER 8, 2020  
pk