



\$~13

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

CNR No. DLHC010485412026

+ **CS(COMM) 1100/2026**

KANGANA RANAUT

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Saket Sikri, Ms. Anasuya Choudhary, Ms. Prakhar Khana, Mr. Vikalp Mudgal, Mr. Shameen Yaser and Ms. Sudha Pradhan, Advs.

versus

META PLATFORMS INC AND ORS

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC with Mr. Naveen, G.P., Mr. Sanskar Gupta, Mr. Tushar Hazrati and Mr. Kautilya Birat, Advs. for D-10 & 11.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

08.10.2026

I.A. 27934/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing true typed/translation copies of dim documents)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

I.A. 27936/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption)

3. The present application has been filed by the plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing Certified copies of the original documents.
4. Certified original copies of the documents shall be produced/filed, if sought, strictly as per the provisions of Commercial Courts, Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts Act, 2015



(hereinafter, 'Commercial Courts Act') and DHC (Original Side) Rules, 2018 and the Delhi High Court Intellectual Property Division Rules, 2022.

5. Accordingly, the application is allowed and stands disposed of.

I.A. 27935/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 149 read with Section 151 CPC seeking enlargement of time to file deficient Court fees)

6. The present application has been filed by the plaintiffs under Section 149 read with Section 151 of CPC, seeking exemption from payment of Court fees at the time of the filing of the suit.

7. Considering the averments made in the present application, an extension of two weeks is granted to affix the requisite Court fees.

8. The Registry is directed to list the matter before the Court, if the deficient Court fee is not paid within a period of two weeks from today.

9. Accordingly, the application is allowed and stands disposed of.

I.A. 27929/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from institution of pre-litigation mediation under Section 12A of Commercial Courts Act, 2015)

10. This is an application filed by the plaintiff seeking exemption from instituting pre-institution mediation under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.

11. An urgent relief has been sought by the plaintiff in the present suit. After having examined the plaint and the documents filed along with the plaint, the Court is of the view that relief in application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC [I.A. 27928/2026] is plausibly urgent and genuinely contemplated, for the reasons recorded in detail while dealing with I.A. 27928/2026

12. The application is, therefore, allowed and the plaintiff is exempted



from pre-litigation mediation.

13. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 27933/2026 (by plaintiff under Order XI Rules 1, 3 & 5 read with Section 151 CPC seeking discovery, disclosure and production of documents)

14. This is an application filed by the plaintiff seeking discovery, disclosure and production of documents.

15. Issue notice.

16. Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, learned CGSC appearing on behalf of defendant nos.10 and 11 accepts notice.

17. On plaintiff taking steps, notice be issued to defendant nos.1 to 5, 8 and 9 by all permissible modes.

18. Reply to the application be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

19. List before Court on 03.02.2027.

I.A. 27930/2026 [by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking time to file certificate under Section 63(4)(c) of BSA, 2023]

20. This is an application filed by the plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing the required certificate/affidavit under Section 63(4)(c) of the Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023.

21. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the application is allowed.

22. Let the required certificate be filed within two weeks.

23. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 27931/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking preservation of electronic records, account information, login details and other relevant digital evidence)

24. This is an application filed by the plaintiff seeking discovery,



disclosure and production of documents.

25. Issue notice.

26. On plaintiff taking steps, notice be issued to defendant no.1 by all permissible modes.

27. Reply to the application be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

28. List before Court on 03.02.2027.

CS(COMM) 1100/2026

29. The plaint be registered as suit.

30. Mr. Saket Sikri, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff submits that after the advance copy of the present suit was served, defendant nos.6 and 7 have taken down the offending material. On instructions, he states that defendant nos.6 and 7 may be deleted from the array of parties. Ordered accordingly.

31. Let amended memo of parties be filed by learned counsel for the plaintiff within a period of two weeks.

32. Issue summons to the defendants.

33. Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, learned CGSC appearing on behalf of defendant nos.10 and 11 accepts summons and waives formal service of summons. He submits that copy of the plaint, I.A.s and documents have been received by him. Let written statement be filed by defendant nos. 10 and 11 within 30 days.

34. On plaintiff taking steps, summons be issued to defendant nos.1 to 5, 8 and 9 by all permissible modes.

35. The summons shall indicate that written statement must be filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons.



36. The defendants shall also file an affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the plaintiff, failing which the written statement shall not be taken on record.

37. The plaintiff is 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.

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

39. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

40. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of service, pleadings, admission/denial of documents and marking of exhibits on 04.12.2026.

41. List before Court for framing of issues on a date to be assigned by the learned Joint Registrar.

I.A. 27928/2026 (by plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 read with Section 151 CPC)

I.A. 27932/2026 (by plaintiff under Section 151 CPC seeking dynamic injunction against mirror accounts, impersonation accounts, cloned profiles and substantially identical infringing content)

42. The case set out in the plaint is that the plaintiff is one of the most recognized and accomplished personalities in the Indian entertainment industry and has, over the course of her career spanning more than two decades, earned widespread acclaim, public recognition and goodwill for her work as an actor, producer and public figure.

43. It is stated that the plaintiff has appeared in numerous critically



acclaimed and commercially successful motion pictures including *Queen*, *Tanu Weds Manu Returns*, *Shootout at wadala*, *Game*, *Once upon a time in Mumbai*, *No Problem*, *Kites:The Remix*, *Krish 3*, etc., and has established herself as one of the most prominent and influential public personalities in India. By virtue of her professional achievements, public engagements and continued presence in the public eye, the plaintiff's name, image, likeness, voice and persona have become uniquely and exclusively associated with her.

44. It is contended that the plaintiff is the recipient of several prestigious honours and recognitions, including multiple *National Film Awards* conferred by the Government of India in recognition of her contribution to Indian cinema. The plaintiff has also been conferred the *Padma Shri*, one of the highest civilian awards of the Republic of India, in recognition of her achievements and contribution to the arts.

45. It is also stated that the plaintiff enjoys an extensive public following across India and internationally and is widely recognized by members of the public solely by reference to her name, image, likeness, voice and other distinctive personality attributes. The plaintiff's identity and persona possess immense commercial value and are frequently associated with various brand endorsements including *Reebok India*, *Tata Sky*, *Swachh Bharat*, *Myntra*, etc., public appearances, promotional activities, media engagements and other legitimate commercial ventures.

46. Apart from her accomplishments in the field of cinema and entertainment, the plaintiff presently serves as a Member of Parliament representing the Mandi Parliamentary Constituency in the State of Himachal Pradesh. The plaintiff actively participates in public affairs, governance,



legislative discussions and matters of national importance and regularly communicates with members of the public through various media platforms.

47. Therefore, it is argued that the plaintiff's name, image, likeness, voice, signature, public appearances, speeches and other distinctive attributes have acquired substantial reputation and goodwill and constitute valuable proprietary rights capable of legal protection. Any unauthorized use, misappropriation or exploitation of such attributes is likely to cause injury to the plaintiff and unjustly enrich those seeking to capitalize upon her reputation.

48. Mr. Saket Sikri, learned counsel on behalf of the plaintiff submits that the plaintiff has recently discovered that various social media platforms, webpages and other online platforms were publishing, hosting, circulating and disseminating fabricated statements, manipulated videos, AI-generated content, morphed images and other misleading material falsely depicting or purporting to depict the plaintiff.

49. It is stated that certain AI-generated and digitally manipulated images and videos have been circulated falsely depicting the plaintiff in inappropriate situations. Such content is entirely fabricated, false and misleading and has been created with the intent of attracting public attention, generating sensationalism and causing injury to the reputation, dignity and public image of the plaintiff.

50. It is contended that there are several instances of the impugned content involving manipulated audio-visual material and AI-generated content, that falsely portray the plaintiff as making statements, expressing opinions, or participating in activities that never occurred in reality. Such content is inherently deceptive and is capable of misleading ordinary



viewers into believing the same to be genuine.

51. Further it is argued that the acts of the defendants are not isolated instances but form part of a continuing pattern of unauthorized exploitation of the plaintiff's identity and personality attributes across various digital and social media platforms. The ease with which such content can be created, copied, republished, shared, forwarded and redistributed significantly magnifies the harm caused to the plaintiff.

52. It is stated that in furtherance of the aforementioned material plaintiff has also identified various URLs of AI-generated sexual and explicit deepfakes, manipulated photos and videos, showing plaintiff in inappropriate position.

53. Mr. Sikri, therefore submits that circulation of such manipulated content not only infringes her personality rights, publicity rights, right to identity and right to dignity, but is also capable of misleading members of the public and lowering the esteem in which the plaintiff is held. The injury caused is particularly aggravated in view of the fact that the plaintiff is a sitting Member of Parliament representing the Mandi Parliamentary Constituency, and the impugned content seeks to exploit her public persona and standing for unauthorized and unlawful purposes.

54. He has further prayed for a Dynamic Injunction as the operators of the infringer URLs frequently create alternate accounts, mirror accounts, cloned profiles and replacement accounts after the original accounts are reported, disabled or removed.

55. After having perused the plaint and the documents annexed therewith, and having heard the arguments of learned counsel for the plaintiff, there can be no dispute that the plaintiff's stature inherently grants her proprietary



rights over her personality and associated attributes. This gives her the exclusive right to use these personality attributes for commercial purposes and, consequently, the right to protect various attributes of her persona from unauthorized use or exploitation by third parties.

56. This further includes protection to the plaintiff against such instances of impugned content, involving AI-generated/morphed, sexual, and explicit deepfakes. The Rule 3(1)(b)(ii) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules 2021[hereinafter “the Rules 2021”] also makes it obligatory on the part of the intermediary not to host, publish, transmit etc. any information that is obscene or pornographic.

57. Mr. Sikri has invited attention of the Court to Document-K wherein the URLs of sexual and pornographic AI and morphed content depicting the plaintiff, has been listed.

58. He further draws attention of the Court to page 67, which is part of Document-G, that shows the plaintiff inappropriately. He submits that this Document is fake and this fact has been certified by the fact-check report which has been placed on record as Document-N.

59. The Document-K containing *ex-facie* obscene, morphed/AI generated, sexually vulgar/pornographic content which does not carry any permission from the plaintiff and therefore it should be taken down by the defendants. Likewise, the picture at page 67 of Document-G being AI-generated, is also liable to be taken down.

60. This Court further notes that protection to the plaintiff also extends against the impugned content involving manipulated audio-visual material and AI-generated content that falsely portrays the plaintiff making



statements, attributing false quotes, expressing opinions, or participating in activities that never occurred in reality. Such content is inherently deceptive and is capable of misleading ordinary viewers into believing the same to be genuine. This misrepresentation and misinformation which is being carried out, becomes a more serious concern when used, involving a person such as plaintiff by using her image and current designation along with the insertion of a false quote/false statements.

61. Mr. Sikri has pointed out from the synopsis/plaint two specific quotes, which according to the plaintiff are fabricated statements attributed to her. The plaint is duly supported by an affidavit of the plaintiff. In view of the categorical stand taken by the plaintiff in the synopsis/plaint with regard to the said quotes, such false quotes cannot be permitted to remain available on social media platform. The plaintiff's objection to the false quotes published by defendants would also squarely fall within Rule 3(1)(b)(v) of the Rules 2021.

62. Mr. Sikri has handed over in Court a tabulated list of identified infringing links, which as per his instructions, is a reformatted presentation of the annexed documents of the plaint, containing infringing content against the plaintiff. The same is taken on record and is appended to this order as Annexure-A. Mr. Sikri has also clarified that Annexure-A does not include some of the documents including a satirical meme filed along with the plaint, the taking down/removal of which is not being pressed by the plaintiff for the time being.

63. In the considered opinion of this Court, a perusal of the infringing content enlisted in Annexure-A shows that the plaintiff has a, *prima facie*, strong case and having regard to his well-known, popular and well-accepted



personality, the balance of convenience is tilted in favour of the plaintiff. In case *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction and other directions, as sought, are not passed, irreparable loss and injury, which may occasion, may not be compensated in monetary terms. The apprehension of dent and damage to the image and personality of the plaintiff, *prima facie*, appears to be real and present.

64. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing:-

- I. Defendants (including John Does), their officers, servants, agents, representatives, affiliates and all others acting for and on their behalf are restrained from: (i) creating, publishing, reproducing, disseminating, communicating, hosting, displaying, transmitting, distributing or otherwise exploiting the plaintiff's name, image, likeness, voice, speeches, signature, persona and other personality attributes without the plaintiff's authorization; (ii) creating, publishing, disseminating or communicating any AI-generated content, deepfakes, synthetic media, manipulated videos, manipulated audio recordings, fabricated speeches, false endorsements or impersonation content depicting or purporting to depict the plaintiff; and (iii) creating or operating any account, page, profile, channel, website or digital asset falsely representing any association, affiliation, endorsement or authorization by the plaintiff.
- II. Defendant no.2/Meta, is directed to remove, disable access to, and permanently take down the impugned content identified by the plaintiff and appended as Annexure-A to this order and Document K as filed by the plaintiff along with the plaint, from the platforms operated by them, including but not limited to videos, reels, posts,



accounts, or channels which unlawfully use or imitate the plaintiff's persona within 72 hrs of being communicated a copy of this order by the plaintiff. A compliance affidavit be filed within two (2) weeks.

III. Defendant no. 10 [Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology] and defendant no. 11 [Department of Telecommunication] are directed to issue necessary notifications/directions to all ISPs and TSPs for blocking/removing access to the infringer websites as given in Annexure-A appended to this order and Document-K as filed by the plaintiff along with the plaint, within 72 hrs of being communicated a copy of this order by the plaintiff. A compliance affidavit be filed within two (2) weeks.

65. The defendants are at liberty to approach the plaintiff for the purpose of seeking clarification as to in what manner the URLs pointed out by the plaintiff appended in Annexure-A of the present order and Document-K of the suit filed by the plaintiff are covered by the order of this Court.

66. If any website/social media accounts, which is not primarily an infringing website, is blocked/locked in pursuance of the present order, the said website is permitted to approach this Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to infringe the plaintiff's personality rights and thereafter, the Court would consider modifying the injunction accordingly.

67. Needless to state, that the plaintiff is permitted to notify additional infringing URLs, accounts, channels, or content discovered after the filing of the suit to the defendants who shall thereupon remove or disable access to the same without requiring the plaintiff to institute fresh proceedings.

68. Issue notice.

69. Mr. Satya Ranjan Swain, learned CGSC appearing on behalf of



defendant nos.10 and 11 accepts notice.

70. On plaintiff taking steps, notice be issued to defendant nos.1 to 5, 8 and 9 by all permissible modes.

71. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date.

72. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of service and pleadings on 04.12.2026.

73. Provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC be complied with *qua* the unrepresented defendants within a period of two weeks from today and affidavit of compliance be filed within a period of one week thereafter.

74. List before Court on 03.02.2027.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 8, 2026

aj/AA



ANNEXURE-A

Sl. No.	Respective Defendant No. (Who Posted It)	Document No. and Page No.	URL and Username(if any)	Platform	Plaint Paragraph and Category
1.	Defendant No. 2–Golu Yadav	Document G, Page 56	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/14kNyBF1ANh/?mibextid=wwXlfr Username: Golu Yadav Chetak	Facebook (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para 29– Document G (Fabricated and AI Generated)
2.	Defendant No. 12– JohnDoe	Document I, Page 69	https://www.instagram.com/p/DYhNhKDFlhr/?vrfl=czJxZXM1M2g0b2l6 Username: ktv_hindi	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para 36– Document I (Fabricated Social Media Post and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
3.	Defendant No. 12– JohnDoe	Document J, Page 72	https://www.instagram.com/p/DcMnV0eT3Um/?rpxt=MT huemJ6eXlhY3kybw==	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para 37– Document J (Morphed and AI)



			Username: adv_tariq_anwar	Inc)	Generated Fake News)
4.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document H, Page 68	https://www.instagram.com/reel/DburNe5TADR/?cplk=MXBmbzMxeHM2cjFkeA== Username: gyanverma20	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para35– Document - H(AI Generated FakeVideo Depicting thePlaintiff)
5.	DefendantNo. 12– John Doe (Removed)	Document G, Page 67	https://www.instagram.com/d4unews4?psln=MWNpZ3hzN3RmcTRsNg== Username: d4unews4	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document - G(AI Generated FakeVideo Depicting the Plaintiff)
6.	DefendantNo. 12– John Doe (Removed)	Document G, Page 57	https://www.instagram.com/news.pulse.india11?vrf=MWN0aTJ6ejNueTFyeQ== Username: news.pulse.india1 1	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document - G(AI Generated FakeVideo Depicting the Plaintiff)
7.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document G,(Page 61)	https://www.instagram.com/p/DXyrFgND6ju/?igsh=Znh3a2JramlnYzlx Username: bollymasala63 -	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document G (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the



					Plaintiff)
8.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document G,(Page 62)	https://www.instagram.com/reel/DZb_hb5zQSb/?exln=cmoxZ204aHY5NjJv Username: theclarityshots	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document - G (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed tothe Plaintiff)
9.	DefendantNo. 12– John Doe (removed)	Document G,(Page 63)	https://www.instagram.com/ajabgajab.india?srtk=d2Y4cmgxZmlza2Jn Userna me: ameajabgazab.indi a	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document - G (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
10.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document G,(Page 64)	https://www.instagram.com/p/DX4Oll3gAUA/?igsh=MXZmYzliNzJvNzQ4cg== Username: explainingindians (renamed to Marketinginlast24 hours -	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para29– Document - G (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
11.	DefendantNo. 12–	Document G,(Page	https://www.instagram.com/p/DX6	Instagram (Defendant	Para29– Document -



	JohnDoe	65)	NLXtkehy/?rpxt=dDhvejI2OWVtdTVm Username: hindicinema06	No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	G (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
12.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document L,(Page 76)	https://www.instagram.com/reel/DZb_hb5zQSb/?exln=cmoxZ204aHY5NjJv Username: theclarityshots	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para40– Document - L (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
13.	DefendantNo. 12– John Doe (removed)	Document L,(Page 77)	https://www.instagram.com/ajabgajab.india?srtk=d2Y4cmgxZmlza2Jn Userna me: ajabgazab.india	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para40– Document - L (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
14.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document L,(Page 78)	https://www.instagram.com/p/DX6NLXtkehy/?rpxt=dDhvejI2OWVtdTVm	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms,	Para40– Document - L (Fabricated Social



			Username: hindicinema06	Inc)	MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
15.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document L,(Page 79)	https://www.instagram.com/p/DX4Oll3gAUA/?igsh=MXZmYzliNzJvNzQ4cg== Username: explainingindians (renamed to Marketinginlast24 hours	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para40– Document - L (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
16.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document L,(Page 83)	https://www.instagram.com/p/DXyrFgND6ju/?igsh=Znh3a2JramlnYzlx Usern ame: bollymasala63	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para40– Document - L (Fabricated Social MediaPost and False Statement attributed to the Plaintiff)
17.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document M,(Page 87, 90- 91)	https://www.instagram.com/explore/search/keyword/?q=kangana%20cow w KanganaCow (search)	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para41– Document - M (Instagram Searches showing vastno.of similar



					post)
18.	DefendantNo. 12– JohnDoe	Document M,(Page 88- 89)	https://www.instagram.com/explore/search/keyword/?q=rahul%20gandhi%20kangana%20ranaut Rahul Gandhi and kangana ranaut (search)	Instagram (Defendant No. 1 - Meta Platforms, Inc)	Para41– Document - M (Instagram Searches showing vastno.of similar post)