



\$~44

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

+ **W.P.(C) 5417/2026**

VAIBHAV SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar along with
petitioner in person.

versus

DELHI HIGH COURT AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, Mr. Arnav Mittal
and Mr. Akash Mishra, Advs. for R-1.
Mr. Arvind P. Datar, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Varun Pathak, Ms. Sana Banyal
& Mr. Mrityunjoy Roy, Advs. for R-
2.
Mr. Aditya Gupta and Ms. Vani
Kaushik, Advs. for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **23.04.2026**

CM APPL. 26470/2026 (Exemption)

1. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5417/2026 CM APPL. 26469/2026

3. This petition has been filed by Mr. Vaibhav Singh by stating that he is an Advocate registered with the Bar Council of Delhi and also a member of Delhi High Court Bar Association.



4. He states that the proceeding of one of the Courts of this High Court of 13.04.2026 has been unauthorizedly recorded, uploaded and shared on the social media, which shows the High Court in a bad light.

5. He submits that the recording and uploading of proceedings of this Court without the permission of the High Court is prohibited as per the notification issued by this Court on 04.07.2025. In this regard, he has drawn our attention to page 44 of the paper-book, more specifically paragraphs 5(vii) and 5(viii) of Electronic Evidence and Video Conferencing Rules, 2025 ('2025 Rules'), which we reproduce as under:-

“(vii) Unless expressly permitted by Court, no person, either at Court Point or at designated place or at Remote Point or Advocate's Remote Point, shall record or publish the proceedings or any part thereof, conducted by video conferencing or other modes of audiovisual electronic communication;

(viii) There shall be no unauthorized recording of the proceedings by any person or entity.”

6. He has drawn our attention to the pleadings made in the petition wherein, according to him are the allegations *qua* the respondent nos. 5 to 14. It is his case that they are the ones who have uploaded and shared the proceedings on the social media. In substance, it is his submission that the acts of respondent nos. 5 to 14 are unauthorized and contrary to the 2025 Rules framed by this Court.

7. Issue notice. Learned counsel for respondent nos. 1, 2 & 3 accept notice.

8. Mr. Arvind P. Datar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent no. 2/META would submit that, as of today, the content of the Court proceedings as have been uploaded through URLs as detailed at paragraph



(xv) at page nos. 24 and 25 have been removed with respect to Facebook and Instagram. He also states that, as per his information, it is not technically feasible for respondent no. 2 to proactively identify the specific/offending posts containing unauthorized Court recordings on the social media platform. He submits that, he shall file an affidavit in respect of the stand of the respondent no. 2 *qua* relief no. (vi) in the petition. The affidavit shall be filed within four weeks.

9. The counsel for respondent no. 3/Google LLC has placed before us the notice dated 15.04.2026 received from Union of India, MHA directing Respondent no. 3 to take down an identified URL where the Court recording dated 13.04.2026 was unauthorizedly uploaded. He states that acting upon the said notice, the said Respondent has already taken down the infringing URL. He further states that respondent no. 3 has also removed the posts against the URLs on YouTube as depicted at pages 25 and 26 of the paper-book. He also states that, however, the post against the links on YouTube as depicted at (i) and (v) (at the above pages) have not been removed, as according to him, those links do not have the recording of the Court proceedings dated 13.04.2026.

10. This submission is contested by learned counsel for the petitioner who states that those links also depict the proceedings of 13.04.2026.

11. If that be so, we direct the respondent no. 3 to take down the posts against the links at (i) and (v) at pages no. 25 and 26 of the petition. The respondent no. 3 shall file an affidavit in respect of their stand *qua* relief no. (vi), keeping in view of the contents of the writ petition.

12. Though there is no appearance for respondent no. 4, we note that the petitioner has at pages no. 26 and 27 of the petition has enlisted certain



links, which according to him, has the recording of the Court proceedings dated 13.04.2026. Respondent no. 4 shall take down the posts containing the Court proceedings in those links immediately on receipt of the notice from this Court. Liberty is granted to the counsel for the petitioner to serve a copy of this order for compliance on respondent no. 4.

13. Issue notice to respondent no. 4 and the other respondents, returnable on next date of hearing.

14. Respondent nos. 5 to 14 are directed to file their reply affidavit within two weeks from receipt of notice. In the said affidavit they shall disclose the source from which they obtained the video recording uploaded in the impugned posts.

15. Respondent no. 4 as well will file its affidavit of compliance within two (2) weeks and also its stand qua relief no. (vi), keeping in view the contents of the petition.

16. Respondent nos. 2 and 3 submit that upon receiving intimation from the petitioner or the Registrar General of this Court with regard to any other URLs containing the recording of the hearing dated 13.04.2026, they shall take down the identified URLs in compliance of their obligation under law.

17. Liberty is granted to the counsel for the petitioner, in the eventuality, petitioner finds the said Court proceedings are still available, or uploaded again, on the above platforms/intermediaries to inform the same *via* email to the counsel for the respondent nos. 2, 3 and 4 along with the details of the links/URLs. On receipt of such information, the counsels for the respondent nos. 2, 3 & 4 shall ensure the taking down of the posts forthwith. The email will also be copied to learned Registrar General of this Court.

18. We also note that Rule 3(1)(b)(xi) of the Information Technology



(Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 ('IT Rules'), stipulates as under:-

“3. (1) Due diligence by an intermediary: An intermediary, including [a social media intermediary, a significant social media intermediary and an online gaming intermediary], shall observe the following due diligence while discharging its duties, namely:—

xxx

xxx

xxx

(b) the intermediary shall inform its rules and regulations, privacy policy and user agreement to the user in English or any language specified in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution in the language of his choice and shall make reasonable efforts [by itself, and to cause the users of its computer resource to not host], display, upload, modify, publish, transmit, store, update or share any information that,—

xxx

xxx

xxx

“(xi) violates any law for the time being in force;”

19. A perusal thereof would reveal that the intermediary has an obligation through its Rules and Regulations/Privacy Policy to make reasonable efforts by itself or to cause the users of its computer resource to *not* host, display, upload, modify, publish, transmit, store, update or share any information that violates the law for time being in enforce.

20. In the facts of this case, the violation of video conferencing Rules 2025 is prima facie established. This would make the recording of the Court proceedings dated 13.04.2026 prima facie unauthorized and therefore, its upload by the users of the social media platforms would be in violation of law and therefore, impermissible under the said IT Rules. It is also come to our attention that the user who accesses Webex links for viewing and/or joining the Court proceedings have to mandatorily acknowledge and accept the condition that they cannot record the court proceedings. This consent, in addition makes the recording of the Court hearing by the user unauthorized.



21. However, Respondent nos. 2 and 3 have expressed their inability to ensure that the unauthorized Court recordings are not uploaded on their platform by its users as prayed for at relief no. (vi).

22. If that be so, we accordingly issue notice to the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India through its Secretary for its appearance in the proceedings on the next date of hearing, to ascertain what steps have been taken by the Ministry to ensure compliance of the above provisions. The counsel for the petitioner shall file an amended memo of parties within one week.

23. On receipt of the amended memo of parties, the Registry shall issue Court notice to the newly added respondent, returnable on next date of hearing.

24. Re-notify on 06.07.2026.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

APRIL 23, 2026/sr