



2026:DHC:3222



\$~88

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

+ **W.P.(C) 4696/2026 and CM APPL. 22979/2026**

Date of decision: **13.04.2026**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**SANDEEP SINGH**

.....Petitioner

*(Through: Mr. Apar Gupta, Ms. Avanti Deshpande, Mr. Naman Kumar, Ms. Indumugi C., Advocates.)*

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR.**

.....Respondents

*(Through: Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC, Ms. Avshreya Rudy, CGSC, Ms. Ayushi Srivastava, Mr. Ayush Tanwar, Mr. Arpan Narwal, Mr. Kushagra Malik, Advocates for R-1.*

*Mr. Ankit Parhar, Mr. Tejpal Singh Rathore, Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Ms. Tanish Gupta and Ms. Sanchli Sethi, Advocates for R-2.)*

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**J U D G E M E N T**

**PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)**

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

*“a. Issue a direction to Respondent No. 1 & 2 for restoring/stop withholding the account of the Petitioner on the platform X, bearing the handle “@ActivistSandeep” within the territory of India;*

*b. Issue a writ, direction or order Respondent No.1 to produce the Blocking Order issued under Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 along with all supporting material before this Hon'ble Court; and*

*c. Issue a writ, direction, or order to ensure that any censorship by Respondent No. 1 or 2 with regards to the Petitioner is carried out*



*strictly in accordance with provisions of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the Rules framed thereunder, namely the 8 & 9 of the Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009 and in conformity with the fundamental rights and freedom guaranteed under Article 14, 19(1)(a) and 21 under Part III of the Indian Constitution, insofar as the same pertains to the Petitioner; and*

*d. Pass such other or further writ, order or direction as this Hon'ble Court."*

2. The facts of the instant case would indicate that on 19.03.2026 the petitioner received a communication from X Corp. (formerly known as Twitter) i.e. respondent no.2 herein (hereinafter referred to as “**said Intermediary**”), informing him that a blocking order has been issued by the Ministry under Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (“**the Act**”), and the account of the petitioner has been withheld/blocked in India. It appears that on 27.03.2026, Union of India represented by the Secretary Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology i.e. respondent no.1 herein (hereinafter referred to as “**MeitY**”) called upon the petitioner to furnish a valid ID proof, subsequent thereto, it was given to understand that the petitioner would be afforded an opportunity of hearing before the Inter-Ministerial Committee (“**Committee**”).

3. The matter was called upon for the first time by the Court on 09.04.2026 and the Court directed for issuance of notice.

4. The petitioner, who claims to be a social worker, and is operating an X account submits that he would undertake to remove the alleged objectionable/ offending material, if any, subject to the order(s) to be passed by the Committee, after extending an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. He submits that in case the petitioner is to have any other grievance, liberty be granted to take appropriate recourse in accordance with



law.

5. Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC assisted by Ms. Avshreya Pratap Singh Rudy, CGSC, who is present in Court submits that the identity of the petitioner has already been verified and on 09.04.2026, the petitioner has been informed to avail the opportunity of hearing on 15.04.2026 at 04:15 PM at Electronics Niketan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi before the Committee. It is, thus, submitted that the Committee after hearing the petitioner shall pass appropriate orders and the matter shall be taken to its logical conclusion.

6. Having considered the overall facts and circumstances, the Court finds that the controversy involved herein is largely covered by the decisions passed by this Court in the cases of *Prateek Sharma v. Union of India & Ors.*,<sup>1</sup> *Kumar Nayan v. Union of India & Anr.*<sup>2</sup> and *Shilpa Kumari vs. Union of India & Ors.*<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the Court finds it appropriate to issue following directions:-

- (i) Let the petitioner to appear before the Inter-Ministerial Committee on the date and time as stated hereinabove. On petitioner's appearance, let the said Committee to point out the alleged objectionable/offending material posted by the petitioner on his X account;
- (ii) Let the Inter-Ministerial Committee to then inform the said Intermediary to temporarily block/suspend the alleged objectionable/offending material, and upon compliance with the same let the petitioner's X account be restored;

---

<sup>1</sup> W.P. (C) 4070 of 2026; order dated 06.04.2026

<sup>2</sup> W.P. (C) 4377 of 2026; order dated 06.04.2026



2026:DHC:3222



- (iii) Let further action concerning the present *lis* as also the content of the petitioner's X account be subject to the final adjudication and the order(s) to be passed by the Inter-Ministerial Committee; and
- (iv) 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.
7. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the instant petition stands disposed of along with the pending application.
8. All rights and contentions of the parties are left open.

**(PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV)**  
**JUDGE**

**APRIL 13, 2026**

*Nc*

---

<sup>3</sup> W.P.(C) 4651/2026; order dated 08.04.2026