



\$~26

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

+ CS(OS) 33/2026

X AND ANR

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Ms. Diya Kapur, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nakul Gandhi, Ms. Mridul Crystelle Singh,
Ms. Siddhi Sahoo, Mr. Aditya Ladha, Mr. Raghav
Kumar, Mr Mujeeb, Advocates.

versus

JOHN DOE AND ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Ankit Parihar, Ms. Sneha Dey
and Ms. Shreya Gupta, Advocates for D43.

Mr. Ankit Parihar and Mr Abhishek Kumar,
Advocate for D44.

Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Ms. Shrutiima Eversa, Mr.
Rohan Ahuja, Ms. Aishwarya Debardarshini and
Ms. Jahanvi Agarwal, Advocates for D45.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

%

O R D E R
13.01.2026

**I.A. 707/2026 (Application under Section 149 read with Section 151
CPC by the plaintiffs)**

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiffs/applicants under Section 149 read with Section 151 CPC seeking extension of time to file the requisite court fee.

2. Ms. Diya Kapur, learned Sr. Counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiffs, on instructions, states that the deficient court fee shall be affixed by the plaintiffs within a period of two weeks. The statement is taken on



record.

3. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 706/2026 (Application under Section 151 CPC by the plaintiffs)

4. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiffs/applicants under Section 151 CPC seeking direction to take on judicial record the pen drive in a sealed envelope.

5. Ms. Diya Kapur, learned Sr. Counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiffs submits that since the case pertains to the pornographic, morphed and AI-generated deepfake content falsely depicting the plaintiffs in sexually explicit and compromising positions across numerous publicly available online platforms and websites, the name of the plaintiffs/applicants in the record which is made available on the judicial website of this Court be masked.

6. In view of the prayer made and the submissions articulated by Ms. Diya Kapur, present application is allowed. The Registry of this Court is directed to take on record the pen drive.

7. The Registry is further directed to mask the name of the plaintiffs in the judicial record as well as the orders of the present suit, which will be uploaded on the website.

8. The application stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 33/2026

9. The plaint be registered as a suit.

10. Ms. Diya Kapur, learned senior counsel for the plaintiff submits that the Union of India (through MeitY) be impleaded as defendant in the present suit since its presence is necessary in order to enable the Court to effectually and completely adjudicate and settle all the questions involved in the suit.



Further, presence of UOI is also necessary to ensure that interim and final relief sought in the present suit, if granted, is effectively implemented.

11. In view of the above submission of Ms. Kapur, Union of India (through MeitY) is impleaded as defendant no. 46 in the present suit.

12. Let amended memo of parties be filed within a period of three days.

13. Issue summons.

14. Mr. Ankit Parihar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of defendant nos. 43 and 44 accepts summons and waives the formal service of summons. Likewise, Ms. Shruttima Ethersa and Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Advocates accept notice for defendant no. 45 and waive the formal service of summons. They submit that complete copy of the paper book including plaint, applications and the documents have been received by them. Let written statement be filed by them within 30 days.

15. On plaintiffs taking steps, summons be issued to the remaining defendants including newly impleaded respondent no. 46, by all permissible modes returnable on 23.02.2026. The summons shall indicate that written statement must be filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons. The defendants shall also file an affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the plaintiffs, failing which the written statement shall not be taken on record.

16. The plaintiffs are at liberty to file replication thereto within thirty days after filing of the written statement. The replication shall be accompanied by affidavit of admission/denial in respect of the documents filed by the defendants, failing which the replication shall not be taken on record.

17. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.



18. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.
19. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of pleadings, service, admission of denial of documents and marking of exhibits on 23.02.2026.
20. List before Court after completion of pleadings.

I.A. 705/2026 (Application under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC by the plaintiffs)

21. Issue notice on this application to the defendants by all permissible modes.
22. Mr. Ankit Parihar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of defendant nos. 43 and 44 accepts notice. Likewise, Ms. Shruttima Eversa and Ms. Mamta Rani Jha, Advocates accept notice for defendant no. 45.
23. The present suit has been filed by the plaintiffs against the defendants seeking relief of permanent and mandatory injunction along with damages on account of defendants' deliberate, unlawful and *mala fide* acts of posting, hosting, publishing, circulating, uploading and/or otherwise disseminating either directly or indirectly, objectionable and derogatory contents of various internet website and digital platforms under their ownership, control and/or operation.
24. The case set out in the plaint is that plaintiff nos. 1 and 2 jointly operate a well-established digital content creation channel under the brand name "Slayy Point" on which plaintiffs create fun videos, millennial friendly topics and travel blogs.
25. It is stated that the plaintiffs have substantial and quantifiable digital presence on major social media platforms as has been set out in Para 10 of



the plaint. Defendant nos. 1 to 7, 9 and 13 to 41 are John Does which comprises of unknown persons whose identify, contact details and locations are presently not ascertainable by the plaintiffs. It is alleged that these individuals are directly responsible for creating, publishing, uploading, reproducing, republishing and/or otherwise communicating to the public, the impugned content, including but not limited to deepfake and AI generated videos, morphed and doctored audio-visual content, and manipulated images impersonating plaintiffs. Defendant no. 8 and defendant nos. 10 to 12 are described as websites which are hosting the impugned content.

26. It is stated that on or around October, 2025, plaintiff no.1 discovered that her visual features, overall physical appearance and likeness has been digitally manipulated, morphed and superimposed on pornographic medias and videos, which were being unlawfully published and widely circulated on multiple websites and online platforms. Further investigation has revealed that these morphed and AI generated images of plaintiff no.1 are permanently displayed on pornographic website, especially on defendant nos. 8, 12, 13 and 14 and other similar websites.

27. Ms. Kapur submits that plaintiffs continue to suffer grave and ongoing harm as a direct consequence of the continued indexing and visibility of the impugned content inasmuch as routine searches for the plaintiffs' name or their well-known digital channel "Slayy Point" disproportionately yield the links to the impugned morphed, obscene and AI-Generated materials. She submits that plaintiffs have already represented to defendant no. 45. However, the offending content has not been removed.

28. Ms. Kapur contends that after the advance notice of the present suit was served on defendant no. 43, it has removed the objectionable content



from its platform. However, the content is still available on the Youtube, X (formerly Twitter) and Google searches.

29. The pen drive containing the objectionable and defamatory material was handed over across the Bar. On *prima facie* perusal of the same it appears that the content is completely defamatory, derogatory and is a patent breach of the plaintiffs' fundamental right to privacy.

30. Under these circumstances, this Court is of the view that plaintiffs have made out a *prima facie* case for passing of interim injunction. The balance of convenience is also in favour of the plaintiffs and they shall suffer irreparable loss in case interim directions are not passed till the next date of hearing.

31. Accordingly, under the aforesaid circumstances, following directions are passed:

a. An ad-interim injunction is passed against defendant nos. 1 to 41, namely social media accounts/handles and third party porn websites, restraining them from uploading, sharing and disseminating in any manner, either by their own handles/accounts/websites or any other third party accounts/handles websites, any offending non-consensual explicit images of the plaintiff.

b. Defendant nos. 1 to 41 are also directed to immediately take down the URLs as enumerated in para 43 and 48 of the plaint containing the offending images and from any other URLs that may have been created by them containing such offending images.

c. Defendant nos. 43 to 45 are also directed to forthwith takedown the URLs containing the offending images from their respective platforms as enumerated in para 43 and 48 of the plaint, if not already



done.

d. Defendant no.45 (Google) is also directed to de-index specified URLs from the Google search engine.

e. The plaintiffs are at liberty to notify defendant nos. 43 to 45 or any other intermediary platforms/website(s), of any subsequently discovered URLs containing the offending Suit images or identical content, as found on their respective social media platforms and/or websites, which shall be acted upon by the said defendants. In case there is any doubt whether the notified URLs fall within the scope of the subject matter of the suit, then the said defendants or intermediaries are at liberty to seek clarification from the plaintiffs, who may then apply to the Court accordingly.

f. Newly added defendant no. 46, Union of India (through MeitY), is also directed to block the websites enumerated in Para 43 and 48 of the plaint. Defendant no. 46 is also directed to pass appropriate directions to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to block the URLs of the individual web pages of the websites of defendant nos. 8, 10, 11 and 12.

g. The plaintiffs are also at liberty to notify any other objectionable websites containing the offending content, to defendant no. 46/UOI for taking appropriate action in terms of directions given hereinabove.

32. At this stage, Ms. Kapur also urges that necessary direction may be given to defendant nos. 43 and 45 to disclose the basic subscribers' information and complete details of the defendants to the extent they relate to their respective platforms.



33. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of defendant nos. 43 to 45 submits that without prejudice to their rights and contentions, directions as urged by Ms. Kapur may be passed in the peculiar facts of the present case.
34. Having considered the submissions of Ms. Kapur as well as the submissions of learned counsel for the defendant nos. 43 to 45, it is directed that defendant nos. 43 to 45 shall disclose the specific subscribers' information and complete available details of the defendants pertaining to their respective platforms.
35. Let reply to the application be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto be filed before the next date of hearing.
36. Re-notify on 30.01.2026 before Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 13, 2026/jg