



2025:DHC:3424



\$~O-57

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

+ **CS(OS) 257/2025 & I.A. 10550/2025**

Date of Decision: **05.05.2025**

IN THE MATTER OF:

SAMMAAN CAPITAL LTD.

FORMERLY KNOWN AS:

INDIABULLS HOUSING FINANCE LIMITED

THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE;

MR. MOHIT BHADA

REGISTERED OFFICE AT:

A-34, 2ND AND 3RD FLOOR,

LAJPAT NAGAR – II,

NEW DELHI – 110024

CORPORATE OFFICE AT:

1ST FLOOR, TOWER 3A,

DLF CORPORATE GREENS, SECTOR – 74A,

GURGAON, NARSINGHPUR,

HARYANA, INDIA – 122004

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Rajiv Nayar, Sr. Adv. and Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Sr. Adv. along with Ms. Kanika Agnihotri, Mr. Karan Luthra, Mr. Vaibhav Agnihotri and Mr. Harshit Kiran, Advs.

versus

BHUPINDER SINGH RANA

E-78, FF, VISHVKARMA COLONY,

JAITPUR, NEAR PETOL PUMP

NEW DELHI -110044

ALSO AT:

FLAT NO. 506, 5TH FLOOR

TOWER KM-12,



2025:DHC:3424



KOSMOS, SECTOR 134
NOIDA, 201304

.....DEFENDANT NO.1

JAYA RANI
E-78, FF, VISHVKARMA COLONY,
JAITPUR, NEAR PETOL PUMP
NEW DELHI -110044

ALSO AT:
FLAT NO. 506, 5TH FLOOR
TOWER KM-12,
KOSMOS, SECTOR 134
NOIDA, 201304

.....DEFENDANT NO.2

KARAN RANA
E-78, FF, VISHVKARMA COLONY,
JAITPUR, NEAR PETOL PUMP
NEW DELHI -110044

ALSO AT:
FLAT NO. 506, 5TH FLOOR
TOWER KM-12,
KOSMOS, SECTOR 134
NOIDA, 201304

.....DEFENDANT NO.3

TWITTER INTERNATIONAL COMPANY
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT:
1355 MARKET STREET,
SUITE 900, SAN FRANCISCO,
CA 94103, USA

ALSO AT:
ONE CUMBERLAND PLACE,
FENIAN STREET DUBLIN 2,
D02 AX07, IRELAND

ALSO AT:



2025:DHC:3424



TWITTER COMMUNICATIONS INDIA
PRIVATE LIMITED
C-20, G BLOCK,
NEAR MCA BANDRA KURLA COMPLEX,
BANDRA (E) MUMBAI
MUMBAI CITY MH 400051 IN

ALSO AT:
UNIT NO.101, FIRST FLOOR,
TOWER 'B',
RMZ INFINITY, OLD MADRAS ROAD,
BENNIGANAHALLI,
BENGALURU 560016
KARNATAKA

.....DEFENDANT NO.4

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

JUDGEMENT

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

CS(OS) 257/2025 & I.A. 10550/2025 (filed on behalf of the plaintiff for Injunction under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of CPC)

1. It is seen that the instant matter was earlier taken up on 29.04.2025, wherein learned senior counsel for the plaintiff was granted the liberty to serve the notice on the application I.A. 10550/2025 to the defendants, through *dasti*. Pursuant to the same, learned senior counsel for the plaintiff has placed on record an affidavit of service which reads as under:-

"AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, Harshit Kiran, S/o, Mr. Prabhat Kiran Sinha, aged about 25 years, working as Associate Counsel at SKV Associates with its office at A-118, Third Floor, Defence Colony, New Delhi-110024 do hereby solemnly affirm and declare as follows:



1. *I state that I am the Counsel for the Plaintiff Company Sammaan Capital Ltd. in the above captioned matter.*
2. *I state that the accompanying Civil Suit has been filed on behalf of the Plaintiff herein.*
3. *I state that in compliance of the Order dated 29.04.2025 with respect to the Application filed on behalf of the Plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908: -*
 - a. *The Civil Suit along with the Applications and the Supporting Documents has been duly served on the Defendant Nos. 1-3 through Speed Post at E-78. FF. Vishvkarma Colony, Jaitpur, Near Petrol Pump. New Delhi-11004 and at Flat No. 506. 5th Floor. Tower KM-12. Kosmos. Sector 134. Noida, Uttar Pradesh-201304. A copy of the Letter sent in compliance of Order dated 29.04.2025 with respect to Application filed by Plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 sent to Defendant Nos. 1-3 is enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-1 (COLLY)**. A copy of the receipt of Speed Post at the address of Defendant Nos. 1-3 are enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-II (COLLY)**.*
 - b. *The Civil Suit along with the Application and the I Supporting Documents has been duly served on the Defendant No. 4 at the addresses mentioned in the Memo of Parties. A copy of the Letter sent in compliance of Order dated 29.04.2025 with respect to Application filed by Plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 sent to Defendant No. 1 is enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-III**. A copy of the receipt of Speed Post at the address of Defendant No. 4 is annexed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-IV**.*
4. *I state that in compliance of the Order dated 29.04.2025 of this Hon'ble Court:-*
 - a. *Thave got the Dasti Notice served on the Defendant Nos 1-3 through my elerk. Mr. Neeraj Kumar who was accompanied by Mr. Shravan Tiwari, So, Me. Dal Singar Tiwari, working as Area Collection lead at the Plaintiff Company, I state that the Dasti Notice has been received by Sauniya Rana, Daughter in Law of Defendant Nos. 1-2 and Sister-in-Law of Defendant No 3 on 01.05.2025, on behalf of Defendant Nos.1-3, A copy of the receiving of the Dasti Notice is enclosed herewith and matked as **DOCUMENT P-V**.*



- b. *I state that the Notice along with the Suit along with Applications and Supporting Document have been served on the Defendant Nos. 1-3 by way of Email sent vide skvva@skassociates.com at rana.associates@yahoo.co.in on 02.05.2025. A copy of the email dated 02.05.2025 is enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-VI**.*
- c. *The Notice along with Civil Suit, Applications and the Supporting Documents has been duly served on the Defendant No. 4 by way of Email sent vide skyva@skvassociates.com at [twitter-legala.com](https://twitter.com/legala.com) and india-corp.cs/@twitter.com on 02.05.2025. A copy of the email dated 02.05.2025 is enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-VII**.*
- d. *The Notice along with Civil Suit, Applications and the Supporting Documents has been duly served on the Defendant Nos. 1-3 on Whats app at 9350845852. A copy of the screenshot of the Whats App is enclosed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-VIII**.*
- e. *The Notice along with Civil Suit along with the Application and the Supporting Documents has been duly served on the Defendant Nos. 1-4 at the addresses mentioned in the Memo of Parties through Speed Post and the Courier Service approved by this Hon'ble Court. A copy of the receipt of Speed Post at the address of Defendant Nos. 1-4 is annexed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-IX**. A copy of the receipt of Courier at the address of Defendant Nos. 1-4 is annexed herewith and marked as **DOCUMENT P-X**.*
5. *I state that averments stated herein are true to my knowledge and no part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed therefrom."*

2. Upon perusing the document, it is observed that paragraph 4(a) of the affidavit states that the *dasti* notice was served on Sunny Rana, who is mentioned as the daughter-in-law of defendant nos. 1 and 2 and the sister-in-law of defendant no. 3. The affidavit further stated that the notice was served along with all the pending applications and supporting documents.

3. In paragraph no. 4(b) and no. 4(c), it is further stated that the entire



documents were also sent along on e-mail and further in paragraph no. 4(d), it is further stated that the same were sent on WhatsApp as well. Learned senior counsel for the plaintiff orally submits that the number on which the notice and documents were sent on whatsapp also forms part of the loan agreement.

4. Thus, the Court is of the considered opinion that the *dasti* service on the defendants has been validly effected upon and, thus, it is deemed appropriate to proceed with adjudicating on the instant application for injunction.

5. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff submits that the plaintiff is a public limited company duly incorporated under the Companies Act, 1956, and is engaged, *inter alia*, in the business of providing home loans and loans against property. It is submitted that the plaintiff has a significant nationwide presence with operational offices in over 110 towns and cities across India, and commands a wide consumer base spread throughout the country. Learned senior counsel draws the attention of the Court to the financial turnover, industry accreditations, and various recognitions received by the plaintiff over the years to demonstrate the plaintiff's strong market reputation and goodwill.

6. It is further submitted that the plaintiff was originally incorporated as Indiabulls Housing Finance Limited and was registered with the National Housing Bank as a Housing Finance Institution. The plaintiff is also registered as a Non-Banking Financial Company (NBFC) and is stated to be governed by a distinguished Board of Directors, which includes a former Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank of India, eminent ex-bankers, and senior professionals from public sector undertakings. Upon obtaining all



2025:DHC:3424



requisite statutory approvals, the plaintiff underwent a change of name and is now known as Sammaan Capital Limited with effect from the year 2024.

7. It is submitted that the instant civil suit has been filed against the defendants no. 1 to no.4 seeking damages and relief of injunction along with appropriate further directions against purported defamatory statements made by the defendant no.1 to no.3 on the platform established and maintained by defendant no.4.

8. Learned senior counsel submits that the defendants no.1 to 3 are individuals, who have availed a loan facility from the plaintiff for a total amount of Rs. 25,00,000, on a floating rate of interest. Learned senior counsel submits that subsequently another loan facility of Rs. 6,83,294/- was availed by Defendant No. 1 and 2 from the Plaintiff on floating rate of interest.

9. Learned senior counsel submits that the defendant no.4 is a social media platform established in the United States and the grievance against the said defendant pertains to the said defendant permitting publication of information without any checks and balances and for permitting the publication of defamatory or derogatory material and therefore, the platform acts as a medium for people like Defendant No. 1 to 3 to spread the derogatory material.

10. Learned senior counsel submits that the said loan facility availed by the defendants no.1 to 3 was based on loan agreement(s). He submits that there were certain lapses made by the defendants no.1 to 3 in the repayment of the said loan(s) and to escape their contractual liability of repaying the loan, learned senior counsel contends that the defendants have made various frivolous complaints to various statutory authorities and government bodies.



11. He further contends that the said defendants no.1 to 3 have posted various defamatory and derogatory material on the platform administered by defendants no.4 (X formerly known as Twitter). A table of the purported defamatory and derogatory material on the platform is stated in paragraph 7 of the instant application. The said table is reproduced hereunder for reference:-

<i>S.NO</i>	<i>DATE</i>	<i>ACCOUNT & LINK</i>	<i>CONTENT</i>
1.	21.12.2023	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/737759510541033937?t=0SfF1jvifhSBNay057PIuw&s=19	<i>“what a fake bank Indiabulls is? Its openly cheating customer under the nose of @FinMinIndia.”</i>
2.	04.01.2024	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/742908948246577453?t=qAJvW28ksSRwLphoepcTw&s=19	<i>“I am seriously going to expose fraud Indiabulls. Despite of many complaints the Indiabulls official are roaming freely”</i>
	04.03.2024	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/764485801315057744?t=QVa08KblzsJcQ9p78PnjNg&s=19	<i>“I told that @ibhomeloans is the biggest robber who is misusing RBI guidelines and exploiting customers. Chor hai @ibhomeloans. Koi bhi isse loan mat lena”</i>



		yrana2010/status/1807614724839997453?t=-k1oi3tvj0BFRdFpBK6yfg&s=19	
8.	01.07.2024	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/1807676165588664395?t=4TYgav6p2wkYfK6n7cXrg&s=19	<i>“We initiated seeking resolution from government authorities. After a fair audit & shut down of Indiabulls will lead this to end.”</i>
9.	22.08.2024	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/1826482184653320262?t=yCMJ_WtM7LOo-Eqfs1WMIg&s=19	<i>“kab contact kiya mujhe. Me paglo ki tarah intejar kar raha hun tumhari chori k mamle mein magar tum har jageh thagi aur jhooth bolte ho.”</i>
10.	11.04.2025	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/sunnyrana2010/status/1910562407614644339?s=48&t=LP4ykFmw8ozMQCqUJBZlwg	<i>Defamatory video available at Google Drive Link</i>
11.	13.04.2025	@sunnyrana2010 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/1911466681899114	<i>“Samaan Capital former Indiabulls biggest fraud but backed with powerful X CGI, RBI etc.” Defamatory video available at</i>



		589?t=IrQJx6dc7A8SfvoomQAHmg&s=19	<i>Google Drive Link</i>
12.	20.04.2025	@sunnyrana2010, @Rana_BS56 https://x.com/Sunnyrana2010/status/1913855462010745328	<i>“Expose this Indiabulls who is robbing 72 years old man & slapping him with police challan with 2 cross border state. Sachin Chudri from India bulls chor hai.” Defamatory video available at Google Drive Link</i>

12. Learned senior counsel further submits that the actions of the defendants no. 1 to 3 was not confined only to making defamatory statements on social media platforms, but has spilled over to the point that on 11.04.2025 the Defendant No. 1 to 3, pasted pictures of Directors/key managerial persons of the Plaintiff on a car bearing registration no. DL3CBN1518 Model Indigo, make Tata Motors (hereinafter referred to “Indigo Car”). To further defame the Plaintiff, the Defendant No. 1 to 3, placed a garland of shoes around the abovesaid pictures of the Directors/Senior Management of Plaintiff. The said Defendants also pasted print outs with derogatory and defamatory statements alleging that the Plaintiff has cheated the Defendant No. 1 to 3.

13. Heard learned senior counsel on the instant application.

14. The Court has perused the content available on the record of the Court and is of the *prima facie* view that the material posted by the defendants is defamatory.

15. The Court is conscious of the rights of the individual defendants



expressing their disputes/criticism/opinion, etc in their capacity as consumers and they are lawfully entitled to do so. However, the Court is also conscious of the jurisprudence on the aforesaid freedom of expression and the bounds of lawful criticism. A perusal of the material available on record would indicate that the actions undertaken by the defendants steps beyond the legal and permissible domain and entered into targeted harassment and defamation. Under the guise of voicing a consumer complaint, the defendants have engaged in an orchestrated effort to publicly vilify a reputable corporate entity in violation of the law.

16. On this aspect, reference can be made to the decision of this Court in CS(OS) 159/2025, vide order dated 12.03.2025, passed in the case of ***Isha Foundation v. Google LLC & Others***, wherein it was noted the need to balance between the freedom of speech/expression and the right to reputation of an individual. The Court therein noted that reputation is an integral part of dignity and every entity/individual has the right to live with and protect their dignity. The relevant portion of the said order reads as under:-

“12. 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. The video does have a direct impact on the reputation of the founder of the Plaintiff/Trust.”

17. Moreover, in ***Isha Foundation***, the Court undertook a detailed analysis of the jurisprudence governing the grant of ex-parte injunctions in cases of alleged defamation. In doing so, the Court placed reliance upon



*Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund v. Kartick Das*¹, wherein the parameters guiding the grant of such relief were laid down. The Court noted that an ex-parte injunction is to be granted only in exceptional circumstances, and such relief must satisfy not only the general principles governing interim injunctions, namely, the existence of a *prima facie* case, balance of convenience, and the likelihood of irreparable injury, but also additional considerations. These additional considerations include whether irreparable or serious mischief would be caused in the absence of the injunction, whether the refusal of such relief would result in greater injustice than its grant, the time at which the plaintiff became aware of the complained act (to assess any delay or acquiescence), and whether the applicant has approached the Court with utmost good faith. Even where granted, such orders are to be in force only for a limited duration. The relevant portion of the said decision reads as under:-

“Q. 4: What are the guiding principles in relation to the grant of an ad interim injunction in such areas of the functioning of the capital market and public issues of the corporate sector and whether certain ‘venue restriction clauses’ would require to be evolved judicially as has been done in cases such as Sanchaita case [(1982) 1 SCC 561 : 1982 SCC (Cri) 283] etc.?”

36. *As a principle, ex parte injunction could be granted only under exceptional circumstances. The factors which should weigh with the court in the grant of ex parte injunction are—*

- (a) whether irreparable or serious mischief will ensue to the plaintiff;*
- (b) whether the refusal of ex parte injunction would involve greater injustice than the grant of it would involve;*
- (c) the court will also consider the time at which the plaintiff first had notice of the act complained so that the making of improper order against a party in his absence is prevented;*
- (d) the court will consider whether the plaintiff had acquiesced for sometime and in such circumstances it will not grant ex parte injunction;*

¹ (1994) 4 SCC 225



(e) *the court would expect a party applying for ex parte injunction to show utmost good faith in making the application.*

(f) *even if granted, the ex parte injunction would be for a limited period of time.*

(g) *General principles like prima facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss would also be considered by the court.”*

18. The ratio of the decision of *Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund* has been recently reiterated by the Supreme Court in the case of *Bloomberg Television Production Services India (P) Ltd. v. Zee Entertainment Enterprises Ltd*², wherein the Court observed that pre-trial and ex-parte injunctions, particularly in defamation suits must be sparingly used and only in truly exceptional circumstances. The Court therein noted that an injunction restraining publication has grave implications on the constitutional right to free speech as guaranteed under Article 19(1)(a) of the Constitution of India, and on the public’s corresponding right to receive information. The Court reiterated that the foundational threefold test for interim relief must not be applied in a mechanical manner. Instead, the court must engage in a detailed factual evaluation and provide reasoned findings to demonstrate that these tests are truly satisfied. Drawing from the *Bonnard v. Perryman*, (1891) 2 Ch 269 (CA) standard, the Supreme Court emphasized that unless the defamatory material is shown to be “manifestly false or malicious,” no interim injunction should ordinarily be granted prior to trial. The burden lies heavily upon the plaintiff to demonstrate that the material is clearly indefensible. Absent such a showing, Courts must decline to restrain publication so as not to stifle democratic discourse.

19. In the facts of the present case, it *prima facie* appears that the dispute originates in a contractual relationship between the parties, bearing the



character of a lender-borrower arrangement. The defendants, who are stated to be the borrowers, have allegedly failed to honour their obligations under the loan agreements executed between the parties.

20. In addition to the alleged contractual default, the defendants are also stated to have engaged in a targeted campaign against the plaintiff by publishing and disseminating defamatory material calculated to injure the reputation of the plaintiff entity. The immediate provocation for the present suit appears to be the incident dated 11.04.2025, wherein Defendant Nos. 1 to 3 are alleged to have affixed photographs of the Directors and key managerial personnel of the plaintiff entity onto a car bearing registration no. DL3CBN1518.

21. To compound the insult and inflict reputational damage, the said photographs were encircled with garlands made of shoes, and further accompanied by printed materials containing derogatory and defamatory statements imputing that the plaintiff had defrauded the said defendants. These acts, if proven, *prima facie* constitute a deliberate and malicious attempt to publicly defame the plaintiff and its management in a manner that exceeds the legitimate contours of critique and expression.

22. This act of garlanding the photographs of the key managerial personnel of the plaintiff entity with shoes, accompanied by the circulation of the said visuals on social media, including platforms operated by Defendant No. 4, constitutes, *prima facie*, a case of serious and irreparable mischief orchestrated by Defendant Nos. 1 to 3. The plaintiff, being a financial institution engaged in the business of lending, inherently depends upon the preservation of its commercial reputation and the public perception



of integrity and trust. The dissemination of such allegedly defamatory content, both in the physical realm and through digital circulation, appears to be a calculated effort to undermine the standing of the plaintiff in the eyes of the public and its clients. Such acts, if left unchecked, may cause irreparable loss to the goodwill and business prospects of the plaintiff entity.

23. On the contrary, the defendants no.1 to no.3, if restrained from publishing or further disseminating the impugned content, are unlikely to suffer any comparable prejudice, as no legal or reputational right of theirs appears to be implicated in such restraint. They also seem do not seem to be engaging in any criticism, but seem to be overstepping their freedom of expression. Accordingly, the balance of convenience tilts in favour of the plaintiff.

24. Although the plaintiff appears to have remained acquiescent in respect of social media posts that have been published since 2023, the present trigger appears to be the public vehicle display, which has taken the defamatory campaign beyond the virtual space and into a conspicuously public spectacle.

25. Reference can also be made to a recent decision of this court in ***Ruchi Kalra v. Slowform Media (P) Ltd.***³, which supports the notion that each publication of defamatory content gives rise to a new cause of action. The relevant paragraph affirming this is reproduced below:

“56. This Court in the case of Arvind Kejriwal v. State,²⁶ was dealing with the question of whether the act of ‘re-tweeting’ amounts to ‘re-publication’. While answering the said question in affirmative, the Court held that retweeting or reposting defamatory content, without any disclaimer as to whether the person so retweeting agrees or disagrees or has verified the content so posted or not, and as to

³ 2025 SCC OnLine Del 1894



whether he projected to the world at large, who care to follow him, that he believes the content to be true so shared, a person would be republishing the original defamatory content which has the potential of lowering the moral or intellectual character or credit of a person. The Court observed as under:—

“63. In case, the act of retweeting or reposting is allowed to be misused since it is still considered to be a vacant grey area of law where the sapping of jurisprudence as to whether retweeting defamatory content will be considered publication or not is yet to take place, it will encourage people with ill intentions to misuse this vacant field of law and therefore, despite retweeting the defamatory content, the accused can thereafter conveniently take a plea that he had merely retweeted a content.

64. In this background, this Court holds that retweeting or reposting defamatory content, without any disclaimer as to whether the person so retweeting agrees or disagrees or has verified the content so posted or not, and as to whether he projected to the world at large, who care to follow him, that he believes the content to be true so shared, a person would be republishing the original defamatory content which has the potential of lowering the moral or intellectual character or credit of a person.

65. A sense of responsibility has to be attached while retweeting content about which one does not have knowledge. Since in case reputational injury is caused by defaming a person, the person doing so by retweeting must attract penal, civil or tort action against him in absence of any disclaimer.

66. If we assume that the law exclusively attributes harm to the original author of a post in cases of defamation, a potential loophole emerges. Any case has to be adjudicated in its accompanying circumstances and the background of not only the facts but the actors of the act in question. When a vast majority follows a particular person on twitter, not all, may be aware of the nitty gritty of tweets or retweets. Most common persons who follow a person, who may be an influencer for a particular segment of community will find it enough reason to believe a content just because the content is posted on account of a particular person.”

58. Thus, on the conspectus of the precedents cited above, it is crystal clear that as per Article 75 of the Limitation Act, the period of limitation is one year from the date of publication of the new libel.



Moreover, each republication gives rise to a fresh cause of action, thereby resetting the clock. Therefore, the ticking of the clock stops and resets the moment the defamatory article is republished, thereby rendering a fresh cause of action and accordingly, a fresh period of limitation would commence again.”

26. In view of the foregoing, the Court is of the considered opinion that the necessary ingredients for the grant of an interim injunction in a defamation suit have been met. The plaintiff has *prima facie* demonstrated the existence of a compelling case based on balance of convenience, the likelihood of irreparable injury, and the targeted nature of the defamatory conduct. Moreover, in the absence of any justification offered by the defendants despite notice having been served, the allegations stand un rebutted at this stage.

27. If the impugned material is not taken down or further restrained, the plaintiff is likely to suffer grave and irreversible damage to its reputation, which cannot be remedied through monetary compensation alone.

28. In view of the aforesaid reasons, the Court hereby issues the following directions:-

- I. The defendant Nos. 1 to 3 are hereby directed to forthwith remove and delete from all social media platforms, including but not limited to their accounts on the platform “X” (formerly known as Twitter), all defamatory posts, videos, and other media content published against the plaintiff and/or its directors, key managerial personnel, and officers, including but not limited to the material specifically referred to in paragraph 7 of present application.
- II. The defendant Nos. 1 to 3 are further restrained from posting, circulating, or publishing any additional content forming part of



2025:DHC:3424



the existing thread or trail of posts emanating from the social media accounts bearing handles “@Sunnyrana2010” and “@rana_bs56”, or from any other account, pseudonymous or otherwise, operated by them or any person acting on their behalf or at their instance.

III. In the event defendant Nos. 1 to 3 fail to comply with the aforesaid directions within 24 hours from the time of service of this order, defendant No. 4 (X Corp formerly known as Twitter) is directed to take down all such content referred to in paragraph Nos. 6 and 15 of the present order from its platform, forthwith and without awaiting any further communication or request.

29. The aforesaid directions shall remain subject to further orders that may be passed by this Court.

30. Let the provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 be complied with within one week from today.

31. It is clarified that all observations made herein are purely *prima facie* and are not to be construed as binding or conclusive findings. All questions of fact and law shall be adjudicated upon at the appropriate stage in the course of trial. Nothing stated in this order shall prejudice the rights or contentions of either party during the trial.

32. I.A. 10550/2025 stands disposed of.

33. List this matter before the concerned Joint Registrar on 01.09.2025.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

MAY 05, 2025/p/sph

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)