



\$~49

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

+ **CS(OS) 159/2025**

ISHA FOUNDATION

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Manik Dogra, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Simranjeet Singh, Mr. Gautam
Talukdar, Ms. Pushpaveni Kakkaje,
Mr. Rohit Gandhi, Mr. Rishabh Pant,
Mr. Yajat Gulia, Advocates

versus

GOOGLE LLC & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Ms. Asavari Jain and Mr. Aditya
Gupta, Advocates for D-1/Google
LLC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

ORDER

% **12.03.2025**

I.A. 6735/2025 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

I.A. 6734/2025

1. The present application under Section 151 of CPC has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking exemption from effecting advance service on the Defendants.

2. The Plaintiff has approached this Court for restraining Defendant No.4 from utilizing any media outlet and/or social media platforms to make libellous, misleading and disparaging allegations against the Plaintiff; and for restraining the spread of false news, motivated propaganda and



disinformation campaign relating to the Plaintiff and also for a direction to Defendant Nos.1, 2 & 3 to bring down the video/posts/publications/allegations against the Plaintiff which has been uploaded at these links as mentioned in paragraph No.8 of the plaint i.e., <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtiHOM5i> and <https://www.youtube.com/@ShyamMeeraSingh1>.

3. It is stated by the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff that since the Plaintiff apprehends that Defendant No.4 might bring down the offending video in order to overreach the issue that would be presented before this Court and later on upload the same, the Plaintiff is, therefore, seeking exemption from effecting advance service on the Defendants.

4. In view of the reasons stated in the application, this Court is inclined to entertain the suit without advance service on the Defendants.

5. The application is disposed of.

CS(OS) 159/2025

1. Alleging that the Defendant No.4 has indulged in making and circulating a defamatory video dated 24.02.2025 against the Plaintiff, a registered Public Charitable Trust, which is for imparting yoga and spiritual knowledge, the Plaintiff has approached this Court by filing the present suit seeking the following prayers:

“a) Pass a decree of permanent & mandatory injunction against Defendant Nos. 1-5 to immediately delete/remove/take down the defamatory video listed in Paragraph 8 of Plaint and all the videos/posts/publications/allegations emanating out of the defamatory video as listed in Paragraph 11-13 of the Plaint, or any other videos/posts/publications/allegations which are



identical to, or similar in content, on the internet through social media platforms, websites, blogs, or any other media such as the Metaverse, blockchain, any Artificial Intelligence program, or any other media such a print, audio-visual etc. which are defamatory with respect to the Plaintiff, and;

b) Pass a decree of permanent injunction against the Defendants No.1-5, their associates, servants, agents, affiliates, assignees, substitutes, representatives, their subscribers, employees and/or persons claiming through them and/or under them and all other persons from creating, publishing, uploading, sharing, disseminating etc. the defamatory videos as listed in Paragraph 8 of Complaint and all the videos/posts/publications/allegations emanating out of the defamatory video as listed in Paragraph 11-13 of the Complaint, or any other videos/posts/publications/allegations which are identical to, or similar In content, on the internet through social media platforms, websites, blogs, or any other media such as the Metaverse, blockchain, any Artificial Intelligence program, or any other media such a print, audio-visual etc. which are defamatory with respect to the Plaintiff, and;

c) Pass a decree of damages to the tune of Rs. 3,00,00,000/- (Rupees Three Crore Only) in favour of the Plaintiff and against the Defendants No. 4 and;

d) Pass an order for costs of the present proceedings, and;

e) Pass such further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances.

2. Let the complaint be registered as a suit.
3. Issue summons to the Defendants, to be served through all



permissible modes, including through electronic mode and *dasti* as well, returnable on 08.07.2025 before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial).

4. Let the Written Statement(s) to the plaint be positively filed within the time prescribed under the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 along with the affidavit(s) of admission/denial of the documents of the Plaintiff, without which the Written Statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

5. Liberty is given to the Plaintiff to file the Replication within the time prescribed under the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 along with the affidavit(s) of admission/denial of documents of the Defendants, without which the Replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

I.A. 6733/2025

1. Issue notice.
2. On taking steps, let notice be issued to the Defendants through all permissible modes, including *Dasti*.
3. List on 09.07.2025.

I.A. 6732/2025 (Stay)

1. This application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of CPC has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking grant of ex-parte ad interim injunction against the Defendants.
2. It is the case of the Plaintiff that Defendant No.4 has made and circulated a video dated 24.02.2025 which has the effect of tarnishing the reputation of the Plaintiff which is dedicated to raising human consciousness and fostering global harmony through individual transformation. It is stated that the Plaintiff has been founded by Sadhguru Jagadish Vasudev (*hereinafter referred to as "Founder"*). It is stated that the Founder has



received India's second highest civilian honour i.e. the "*Padma Vibhushan*" in the year 2017. It is stated that the Plaintiff has 16 million followers and about 300 centres spread worldwide. It is stated that the Plaintiff is also certified by the Yoga Certification Board under the Ministry of AYUSH, Government of India as a "Leading Yoga Institute" and it is also recognized by the Department of Personnel Training, Government of India for providing in-service training programmes to the Government Officers.

3. It is stated that Defendant No.4 is a digital content creator/YouTuber/Journalist having social media accounts on the platforms of Defendant Nos.1, 2 & 3 by the name of "*Shyam Meera Singh (@ShyamMeeraSingh1)*". It is stated that Defendant No.4 has around 1.2 million subscribers. It is stated that Defendant No.4 has created and published a video on 24.02.2025 which can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtiHOM5i> and <https://www.youtube.com/@ShyamMeeraSingh1>. It is stated that the said video contains defamatory contents which maligns the image of the Plaintiff/Trust and its founder. Material on record indicates that the basis of the entire video is a purported internal email sent by one of the office bearers of the Plaintiff to another office bearer of the Plaintiff. Material on record further indicates that the Defendant No.4 after extracting the contents of the email sought clarification from the Plaintiff vide an email dated 19.02.2025. The said email was replied to by the Plaintiff on 20.02.2025 stating that the email which has been alleged to have been sent by one of the office bearers of the Plaintiff to another office bearer of the Plaintiff is entirely fabricated and false and no such practice as mentioned in the email is correct or being practised/followed by the Plaintiff. It is also stated in the



email that it is an attempt to defame the Plaintiff. Material on record also discloses that Defendant No.4 also sent another email to the Plaintiff on 20.02.2025 stating that the internal email sent by one of the office bearers of the Plaintiff to another office bearer of the Plaintiff/Trust is not fabricated and that he has verified it from Gmail and further the email is authentic.

4. It is stated by the learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff that the purported internal email which is the basis of the entire video has not been forwarded by the Defendant No.4 to the Plaintiff. Material on record also discloses that Defendant No.4 has not made any effort to reach out to the said office bearers of the Plaintiff or sent any communication to them for confirmation of the alleged internal email having been sent by them.

5. This Court has perused the video, the transcript, emails sent by Defendant No.4 and the responses given by the Plaintiff/Trust to the said emails sent by Defendant No.4.

6. In the opinion of this Court, the contents as mentioned in the video are *per se* defamatory and the same directly impinge upon the reputation of the Plaintiff in eyes of the general public as it states that the Plaintiff follows certain practices which are not accepted in the society.

7. The Apex Court in Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund v. Kartick Das, (1994) 4 SCC 225, has laid down the parameters of granting ex-parte injunction which reads as under:

36. As a principle, ex parte injunction could be granted only under exceptional circumstances. The factors which should weigh with the court in the grant of ex parte injunction are—



(a) whether irreparable or serious mischief will ensue to the plaintiff;

(b) whether the refusal of ex parte injunction would involve greater injustice than the grant of it would involve;

(c) the court will also consider the time at which the plaintiff first had notice of the act complained so that the making of improper order against a party in his absence is prevented;

(d) the court will consider whether the plaintiff had acquiesced for sometime and in such circumstances it will not grant ex parte injunction;

(e) the court would expect a party applying for ex parte injunction to show utmost good faith in making the application.

(f) even if granted, the ex parte injunction would be for a limited period of time.

(g) General principles like prima facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss would also be considered by the court.

8. The aforesaid judgment has been followed by the Apex Court in Bloomberg Television Production Services India (P) Ltd. v. Zee Entertainment Enterprises Ltd., (2025) 1 SCC 741.

9. This Court in Hanuman Beniwal and Others vs. Vinay Mishra and Others, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 4882, has observed as under:

“29. It has been well recognized that in case of libel and slander, interim injunction may be granted in case



(i) the statement is unarguably defamatory; (ii) there are no grounds for concluding that the statement may be true; (iii) there is no other defence which might succeed; and (iv) there is evidence of an intention to repeat or publish the defamatory statement.”

10. Applying the aforesaid law to the facts of the present case, this Court is of the view that the Plaintiff has been able to make out a *prima facie* case in its favour. The learned Senior Counsel for the Plaintiff states that the Defendant No.4 has not forwarded the said email to the Plaintiff/Trust for the Plaintiff to verify as to whether such an email has actually been sent or not by the officer bearers of the Plaintiff/Trust. Hence, this Court *prima facie* is of the view that Defendant No.4 without ascertaining the authenticity of the purported internal email has chosen to make a video based on entirely unverified material.

11. Till now more than 9 lakhs views have already been garnered on the said video and more than 13,500 comments have been received. What is more interesting is that the title of the video is “*Sadhguru EXPOSED: What’s happening in Jaggi Vasudev’s Ashram?*”. In the view of this Court, the title is a clickbait and this Court is *prima facie* of the opinion that the said title has been given only to attract attention. Further, material on record indicates that before uploading the video, tweets and posts were also made by Defendant No.4 on the platform of Defendant No.2 and 3 to promote the said video.

12. It is well settled that reputation is an integral part of the dignity of each individual and there is a need to balance between freedom of speech and freedom of expression vis-a-vis the right to reputation which has been



considered as a part of the right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The video does have a direct impact on the reputation of the founder of the Plaintiff/Trust.

13. Continuous circulation of the video is likely to cause harm to the Plaintiff/Trust's reputation and as stated that more than 09 lakhs views and more than 13500 comments have already been reported. If the video is not taken down immediately, the Plaintiff/Trust will suffer loss of reputation which cannot be compensated monetarily. Balance of convenience also lies in restraining the Defendant No.4 to upload the very same video at any of the social media platforms and directing the Defendant Nos.1, 2, 3 & 4 to bring down the video which has been uploaded at these links as mentioned in paragraph No.8 of the plaint i.e., <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RtiHOM5i> and <https://www.youtube.com/@ShyamMeeraSingh1>.

14. Accordingly, Defendant No.4, his associates, servants, agents, affiliates, assignees, substitutes, representatives, employees and/or persons claiming through him from creating, publishing, uploading, sharing, disseminating etc. the defamatory videos as listed in Paragraph 8 of Plaint and all the videos/posts/publications/allegations emanating out of the defamatory video as listed in Paragraph 11-13 of the Plaint.

15. Defendant Nos.1, 2 & 3 are also directed to bring down the defamatory video as mentioned in Paragraph No.8 of Plaint and all the videos/posts/publications/allegations emanating out of the defamatory video as listed in Paragraph 11-13 of the Plaint.

16. Any member of the public is also restrained from uploading the very same video on any social media platforms till the next date of hearing.



17. List on 09.05.2025.
18. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the CPC be made within a week from today.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

MARCH 12, 2025

S. Zakir