



\$~84

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4070/2026 and CM APPL. 19977/2026**

Date of Decision: **06.04.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

PRATEEK SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Vrinda Grover, with Mr. Apar Gupta, Mr. Nakul Gandhi, Ms. Siddhi Sahoo, Mr. Gurdeep Singh, Mr. Soutik Banerjee Ms. Devika Tulsiani and Ms. Indumugi C., Advocates.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr. Amit Tiwari (CGSC), Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, (CGSC) with Ms. Usha Jannal, Ms. Nyasa Sharma,. Mr. Ankit Khatri, Mr. Amit Gupta, Mr. RV Prabhat, Mr. Shubham Sharma, Mr. Yash Wardhan Sharma, Mr. Naman, Advocates for UOI. Mr. Ankit Parhar, Mr. Tejpal Singh Rathore, Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Ms. Tanish Gupta, Ms. Sanchli Sethi, Advocates for R-2/ X.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner, primarily, to seek the production of a blocking order passed by respondent no. 1-Ministry of



Electronics and Information Technology (hereinafter “**MeitY**”); and the restoration of his account on the respondent no. 2 platform-X Corp. (hereinafter “**X**”).

2. The petitioner contends that it operates an X account with the username “@*DrNimoYadav*”, and has approximately 13,56,000 followers. On 19.03.2026, it is contended that the petitioner received a communication from X, informing him that a blocking order has been issued by MeitY under Section 69A of the the Information Technology Act, 2000 (hereinafter “**IT Act**”), and the account of the petitioner has been withheld/blocked in India. It has also been stated that earlier as well, his account had been suspended, but was subsequently restored by X.

3. The case was first listed before this Court on 30.03.2026 when X placed on record a document containing in a redacted form, *inter alia*, the blocking order dated 18.03.2026 issued by MeitY (hereinafter “**Blocking Order**”). The same was also shared with the petitioner. On the said date, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner Ms. Vrindra Grover had submitted that if the petitioner was to be apprised of the material/content which according to MeitY is objectional, necessary steps in relation thereto could be taken.

4. Mr. Chetan Sharma, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the respondent no. 1 i.e., the Government of India (‘**GoI**’) has brought to the notice of the Court a communication dated 27.03.2026 made by the GoI to the petitioner, requiring the latter to share a valid Government issued identity card for the purposes of identity verification, in order to grant the petitioner an opportunity of hearing before the Inter Ministerial Committee (hereinafter “**Committee**”) to submit his views/ clarification.



5. Ms. Grover has submitted that the Blocking Order passed by MeitY is *de hors* the provisions of the IT Act. She contends that – *first*, the grounds provided under Section 69A for the blocking of information are not applicable to the case of the petitioner; and *second*, that principles of natural justice have not been complied with before the passing of the Blocking Order. However, while reiterating the stand taken by her on the previous date of hearing, she submits that without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the petitioner, he is ready and willing to delete the allegedly objectional tweets in terms of the Blocking Order, and the petitioner’s account on X could, in turn, be restored

6. Mr. Sharma submits that the GoI is conducting itself in accordance with the provisions of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (hereinafter “**IT Act**”) and the Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards For Blocking For Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009 (hereinafter “**the Rules**”). He also contends that the request for restoration of the petitioner’s X account can be looked into by the Committee, which has granted an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. He submits that at this stage the Court ought not to make any interim arrangement.

7. Having considered the submissions made by both the parties and perused the material on record, the Court is of the opinion that the request made by the petitioner, subject to verification of his identity, seems to be reasonable.

8. Accordingly, it is directed that the allegedly objectionable tweets as stated in the Blocking Order be temporarily blocked/suspended, subject to the adjudication to be undertaken by the Committee.

9. Subject to the allegedly objectional tweets being temporarily



blocked/suspended by X, let the petitioner's X account be restored immediately.

10. Since the present directions are being passed being mindful of the review mechanism under Rule 14 of the Rules of 2009, the concerned Committee shall consider all submissions made by the petitioner, including *inter alia*, whether the allegedly objectional tweets are permissible under the IT Act and the Rules framed thereunder.

11. Let the petitioner to also respond back to the GoI's communication dated 27.03.2006 within a maximum period of twelve (12) hours.

12. The petitioner to appear physically before the concerned Committee and, if necessary, shall make a request to be represented/accompanies by an authorized representative. Such a request, if made, shall be considered by the concerned Committee keeping in mind the directions passed by the Division Bench of this Court in *Tanul Thakur v. Union of India & Ors.*¹

13. If the petitioner's grievance is not fully mitigated, he shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

14. The MeitY shall be at liberty to monitor the material posted on the petitioner's X account and, in case, any objectionable material is posted, it shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

15. With the aforesaid directions, the petition, along with pending application, stands disposed of.

16. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

(PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV)
JUDGE

APRIL 6, 2026/aks.

¹ W.P.(C) 13037/2019, Order dt. 11.05.2022.