



\$~41

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

+ **CS(COMM) 816/2025 & I.A. 19396-19400/2025**

UPASANA VOHRA

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Mayank Wadhwa, Mr. Saurabh Yadav, Mr. Rohit Taneja, Mr. Abhishek Garg, Ms. Muskan Gupta, Ms. Ruchi Gupta, Mr. Digvijay Singh, Mr. Mohit Kumar and Mr. Abhishek Wadhwa, Advs.

versus

BEE VITIGO & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Varun Pathak and Mr. Yash Karunakaran, Advs. for D-7

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

11.08.2025

I.A. 19400/2025 (Seeking exemption)

1. This application under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ('CPC'), has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking exemption from filing fair typed copies, copies without proper margins of the documents along with the plaint within two (2) weeks.
2. The fair typed copies, copies without proper margins of the documents mentioned at paragraph 3 of the captioned application be filed within two (2) weeks.
3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

I.A. 19399/2025 (Seeking permission to place on record the pendrive



containing the videos of the plaintiff and defendant nos. 1 to 6)

4. This is an application filed under Section 151 of CPC seeking permission to place on record the pendrive containing the videos of the Plaintiff and Defendant nos. 1 to 6.

5. For the reasons stated in the application, the application is allowed and the Plaintiff is permitted to place on record the pendrive containing the videos of the Plaintiff and Defendant nos. 1 to 6.

6. The application is disposed of.

I.A. 19398/2025 (Seeking disclosure, preservation, and recovery of revenue generated through unauthorised use of plaintiff's original content)

7. Issue notice to Defendant no. 7. Learned counsel for Defendant no. 7 accepts notice. Defendant no. 7 shall file its reply to this application within two (2) weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.

8. In the meantime, Defendant no. 7 will provide the Basic Subscriber Information (BSI) as well as the IP addresses with respect to Defendant nos. 1 to 6, as directed at paragraph 36 of this order.

9. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **22.09.2025**.

10. List before the Court on **21.01.2026**.

I.A. 19397/2025 (Seeking permission to claim actual damages)

11. This an application filed by the plaintiff seeking permission to claim the actual damages and losses suffered by them due to actions of Defendants Nos. 1 to 6.

12. Issue notice to Defendant Nos. 1 to 6 through all modes.

13. Reply be filed within two (2) weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed



within two (2) weeks thereafter.

CS(COMM) 816/2025

14. The Plaintiff has filed the present suit for defamation, permanent and mandatory injunction, passing off, rendition of accounts, damages and the consequential reliefs against the Defendants.

15. Let the plaint be registered as a suit. Issue summons.

16. Mr. Varun Pathak learned counsel appearing on behalf of Defendant no. 7 accepts summons. He waives the right of formal service of summons.

17. Defendant No. 7 is directed to file its written statement within thirty (30) days along with affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff.

18. Summons be issued to Defendant nos. 1 to 6 on filing of process fee. Affidavit of service be filed within two (2) weeks.

19. In the facts of this case, since the addresses of Defendant nos. 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6, available in the memo of parties, is only their social media platform handles, at this initial stage, the Plaintiff is directed to serve a copy of the summons order through the DM facility, by e-mode.

20. Issue summons to Defendant No. 2 through all modes.

21. No summons is being issued to Defendant nos. 8 and 9, as they are proforma parties.

22. The summons shall indicate that the written statement(s) must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of the summons. The Defendants shall also file affidavit(s) of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff, failing which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

23. The Plaintiff is at liberty to file replication(s) thereto within thirty (30)



days after filing of the written statement(s). The replication(s) shall be accompanied by affidavit of admission/denial in respect of the documents filed by Defendants, failing which the replication shall not be taken on record.

24. It is directed that after Defendant no. 7 has provided, the Basic Subscriber Information (BSI) of Defendant Nos. 1 to 6 to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff shall file a fresh memo of parties.

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

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

27. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) for completion of service and pleadings on **22.09.2025**.

28. List before the Court on **21.01.2026**.

I.A. 19396/2025 (Under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908)

29. The present application has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking ad-interim injunction against the Defendant Nos. 1-6 and directions against Defendant Nos. 7 to 9.

30. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff states that the Plaintiff, Dr. Upasana Vohra, is a renowned Ayurvedic practitioner and the owner of a proprietary line of Ayurvedic medicines. He states that she is the proprietor of an Ayurvedic clinic and hospital in Najafgarh, Delhi.

30.1 He states that her medical practice enjoys a high degree of public trust due to her expertise, ethical standards, and contributions to reviving traditional Indian medicine.



30.2 He states that beyond her profession, she is also a social activist, notably as founder of ‘Ek Khwaab’ a platform reuniting missing persons with their families.

30.3 He states that the Plaintiff is a prominent social media influencer in healthcare, wellness, and social education, boasting a substantial digital presence across multiple platforms to advocate for Ayurveda and holistic health, as well as her proprietary Ayurvedic products and services. He states that she personally curates all content shared under her brand, maintaining strict control over its dissemination, and has also applied for trademark registration, as an individual under Class 5, to protect her brand name related to her products.

30.4 He states that her YouTube channel, ‘UPASANA KI DUNIYA’, has over 2.68 million subscribers and more than 570 million views, featuring educational and promotional content on Ayurvedic practices; additionally, her Instagram account, ‘doctorupasanavohra’, has over 1.2 million followers, while her multiple Facebook pages collectively attract approximately 7.5 million followers¹, further enhancing her engagement and visibility in the wellness community.

30.5 He states that these social media platforms form the Plaintiff’s primary outreach channels for health education, product promotion, and public engagement and her name, image, voice, and likeness carry significant goodwill and distinctiveness, making any unauthorized or manipulated use likely to cause severe reputational damage, dilution of brand value, and harm to the trusting public.

¹ Details of various Facebook accounts are mentioned at paragraph 10 of the plaint.



30.6 He states that Defendant No. 1 is operating a Facebook page ‘BEE VITIGO’ (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100093507588721>), and has unlawfully morphed and edited the Plaintiff’s original video available at https://youtu.be/oxZwRjmBrG4?si=b-CR0wAx0wi_942e, so as to falsely depict the Plaintiff recommending a tube-based medicine for Vitiligo. He states that the Plaintiff has never endorsed or promoted such product. He submits that the infringing morphed video is being circulated through the link <https://www.facebook.com/reel/636432152639676>.

30.7 He states that the Defendant No. 2 is operating a Facebook page ‘VENSTY SHOP’ (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61566577894551>) and has similarly misused the Plaintiff’s persona by creating and publishing a manipulated video at <https://www.facebook.com/reel/1396039491813607>, purporting to show the Plaintiff endorsing a so-called secret Japanese hair dye shampoo. He states that the Defendant No. 2 is also engaged in selling the said product through its online store at <http://vensty.in/>, thereby commercially exploiting the Plaintiff’s identity without her consent.

30.8 He states that the Defendant No. 3 is operating a Facebook page ‘SAVVI3’ (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100093714398227>) and has morphed the Plaintiff’s image and voice into a video, portraying her as recommending a cream for joint pain relief, which she has never endorsed. He submits that the infringing video is available at <https://www.facebook.com/reel/993183606254216>, and the related products are being sold at <https://thesavvi.shop/collections/all>.

30.9 He states that the Defendant No. 4 is operating under the name ‘EXPRESS CART’ (<https://www.facebook.com/UHJK53232035165>) and



has circulated a false video available at <https://www.facebook.com/reel/3590264354444619>, in which the Plaintiff is wrongly shown promoting a product called “Perfectx Cream” for knee pain elimination. He states that the Plaintiff has never associated herself with or recommended any such a product.

30.10 He states that the Defendant No. 5 is operating a Facebook page ‘HEY SHOP’ (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100091399287547>) and has manipulated the Plaintiff’s video content to falsely portray her as endorsing an Ayurvedic patch for varicose veins. He submits that the said morphed and infringing video is accessible at <https://www.facebook.com/reel/1301835458110656>.

30.11 He states that the Defendant No. 6 is operating a Facebook page ‘Your Card’ (<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61577142554630>), and has used and circulated a false and misleading video available at <https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1CESmpBqXv/>, in which the Plaintiff is shown as recommending a “Tags and Moles Remover” gel, which she has never promoted or endorsed.

30.12 He states that the Defendant No. 7 is ‘META Platforms Inc.’, the parent company and owner/operator of Facebook and Instagram, which hosts the accounts and pages of Defendants Nos. 1 to 6. He states that despite the infringing content being reported and self-evident, Defendant No. 7 has failed to take action, and such content continues to be available and circulated on the said platforms, enabling the wrongful acts of Defendants Nos. 1 to 6 to persist freely.



30.13 He states that the Defendant No. 8/Department of Telecommunications (DoT), and Defendant No. 9/Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (Meity), have been impleaded as formal parties for the limited purpose of facilitating and ensuring compliance with any blocking, takedown, or enforcement orders issued by this Court and no substantive reliefs are sought against them at this stage.

30.14 He states that the Defendant No. 10, described as 'JOHN DOE', refers to unknown persons or entities engaged in the unauthorized morphing, editing, uploading, and dissemination of the Plaintiff's videos across various platforms, who will be impleaded by name as and when their identities become known.

30.15 He states that the acts of Defendants Nos. 1 to 6 are deliberate, and malicious, involving unauthorized use of the Plaintiff's likeness, voice, and persona to commercially promote products such as creams, shampoos, gels, and patches. He states that such acts are intended to mislead the public and thereby exploiting the Plaintiff's reputation, which amounts to copyright infringement, defamation, passing off, impersonation, and violation of her statutory rights.

30.16 He states that the Defendant no. 7, being the primary platform where several of the infringing contents are being hosted and circulated, is also liable for secondary infringement. He states that despite repeated requests made by the Plaintiff to Defendant No. 7 vide her emails dated 14.05.2025, 15.05.2025 and 29.05.2025 for the immediate removal of the infringing content and for providing essential identifying details of the responsible parties, including IP addresses, account information, and identity particulars of the concerned Defendants, Defendant No. 7 neither acknowledged nor



responded to the Plaintiff's lawful and reasonable requests, thereby demonstrating gross negligence, lack of due diligence, and failure to exercise necessary oversight.

30.17 He states that this inaction on the part of Defendant No. 7 not only enables but also indirectly aids and abets the continuing infringement, defamation, and violation of the Plaintiff's legal and proprietary rights, causing serious and irreparable harm to her professional reputation, public standing, and digital credibility. He states that as such, any safe harbour protection under the law stands revoked for Defendant no. 7 as well, and it is now liable for contributory infringement of the plaintiff's digital copyrights.

30.18 He states that Defendant nos. 1 to 6 have illegally infringed Plaintiff's intellectual property and defamed her by circulating morphed content falsely linking her to uncertified products which has caused dual harm—loss of proprietary rights in her works and damage to her professional reputation—exacerbated by the rapid, wide reach of digital platforms. He also states that public comments label the products as fake, further undermining her goodwill and causing ongoing injury to her credibility.

30.19 He states on perusal of the Plaintiff's social media handles, prima facie it is evident that the Plaintiff is a highly regarded Ayurvedic practitioner and a respected figure in the wellness community, possessing significant social media influence with millions of followers across various platforms. He states the actions of the Defendant nos. 1 to 6, who have unlawfully morphed her original videos to falsely present her as endorsing products she has never known, directly infringe upon her rights and misrepresent her as endorsing products unknown to her. He states the Defendants actions not only undermine her brand but also deceive the public



and exploit her reputation for their own commercial gain. He states that the unauthorized manipulation of her image and voice jeopardizes her professional reputation and the trust she has built over years within her community.

30.20 Lastly, he submits that the reference to Defendants in the prayer clause (a) of the captioned application is incorrect and the interim injunction is sought against Defendant nos. 1 to 6 and Defendant no. 7.

31. Mr. Varun Pathak, Advocate appears on behalf of Defendant No. 7 on advance notice.

31.1 He states that having perused the plaint and the documents filed therewith, Defendant No. 7 has compiled a list of infringing Facebook accounts and infringing posts/videos pleaded in the plaint. He has handed over a list of infringing Facebook accounts and infringing posts/videos posted on the Facebook account. The list is attached below:



Annexure - II Escalated URLs	
LIST OF ESCALATED FB ACCOUNTS	
S.NO	URL
1.	https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100093507588721
2.	https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61566577894551
3.	https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100093714398227
4.	https://www.facebook.com/UHJK53232035165
5.	https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=100091399287547
6.	https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=61577142554630
LIST OF ESCALATED FB POSTS	
S.NO	URL
1.	https://www.facebook.com/reel/636432152639676
2.	https://www.facebook.com/reel/1396039491813607
3.	https://www.facebook.com/reel/993183606254216
4.	https://www.facebook.com/reel/3590264354444619
5.	https://www.facebook.com/reel/1301835458110656
6.	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1CESmpBqXv/
7.	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/19iEFa3Esc/
8.	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/16kq7xbHWY/
9.	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1FY5bbVDDc/
10.	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1Ae8DWGLNE/

31.2 He states that the Plaintiff has not addressed her complaint of copyright infringement to the Grievance Officer; and thus, the grievance redressal mechanism was not initiated and this appears to have led to lack of action. He states that Defendant No. 7 will comply with the orders passed by the Court.

32. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the Plaintiff and has perused the record.

33. The plaintiff, at paragraph 29 of the plaint, has shown a comparison of her original, ethical, and medically sound videos versus the Defendant Nos. 1 to 6 unauthorized, altered versions, which misrepresent her image and



voice to falsely imply endorsement for commercial gain, infringing her copyrights. The table is reproduced as under:

Defendants	Link to Original Videos	Link to Morphed/ Infringing Video
Bee Vitigo	https://youtu.be/oxZwRjmBrG4?si=b-CR0wAx0wi_942e	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/19iEFa3Esc/
Vensty Shop	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oxZwRjmBrG4	https://www.facebook.com/reel/1396039491813607
Savvi3	https://youtu.be/qHCQZI52Xjo?si=hDlcpB78hmmP_nk	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/16kq7xbHWY/
Express Cart	https://youtu.be/Td5jmeX9nbA?si=598j428ibngaN6Ju	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1FY5bbVDDc/
Hey Shop	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jt5LCFW_V90	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1Ae8DWGLNE/
Your Cart	https://www.instagram.com/reel/DLHzChsSgaw	https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1CESmpBqXv/

34. Based on the averments made in the plaint and submissions made on behalf of the Plaintiff, it is evident that Defendant Nos. 1 to 6 are circulating deep fake morphed contents unauthorizedly using the name/mark, face, voice, etc. of the Plaintiff.

35. In view of the averments made in the plaint and submissions made by the learned counsel for the Plaintiff, a prima facie case is made out in favour of the Plaintiff. Balance of convenience is also in favour of the Plaintiff. Irreparable loss, harm and injury would be caused to the Plaintiff if the Defendants are allowed to continue publishing/circulating the aforesaid fake and morphed infringing videos.

36. Consequently, till the next date of hearing, the following directions



are issued:

- a. Defendants Nos. 1 to 6 and their agents, servants, employees, and all others acting on their behalf are restrained from creating, uploading, sharing, publishing, or disseminating any morphed, manipulated, or unauthorized videos or content of the Plaintiff promoting any products without her consent;
- b. Defendant No. 7 or any person acting for or on their behalf, during the pendency of the suit, are directed to forthwith remove/ disable access to the specific pages, URLs, profiles, accounts, videos, photos, publishing any such morphed and infringing content, text, social media groups, and channels as detailed in **paragraph no. 31.1** of this order published on any platform owned, managed or controlled by them within 36 hours.
- c. In case the Plaintiff, during the pendency of the present suit, discover any more false, fabricated and/ or morphed infringing content not originating from or associated with the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff shall be at liberty to approach the Defendant no. 7 requesting them to block/ take down, within 36 hours, any such post/ image/ video/ text/ or any other morphed infringing content, which is published on its platforms or utilizing its platforms. In case Defendant no. 7 raises any doubt, the Plaintiff shall be at liberty to approach this Court for appropriate orders.
- d. The Defendant no. 7 is directed to disclose on affidavit before this Court all available details including Basic Subscriber Information, name, address, email address, contact details, organization and associations, URL, IP address, etc. associated with the accounts



detailed in paragraph no. 31.1 of this order and of any other page and account that may come into the Plaintiff's knowledge in future. This information be filed within two weeks.

37. Issue notice to the Defendant Nos. 1 to 6 through all permissible modes, upon filing of process fees, returnable on the next date of hearing.

38. Let the reply to this application be filed within a period of four (4) weeks, from receipt of notice.

39. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of four (4) weeks thereafter.

40. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of CPC be done within a period of two (2) weeks from today.

41. At this initial stage, Plaintiff is directed to serve a copy of this order on Defendant Nos. 1, 3 to 6 through the DM facility of Defendant no. 7.

42. It is directed that after Defendant no. 7 has provided, the Basic Subscriber Information (BSI) of Defendant Nos. 1 to 6, the Plaintiff shall serve a copy of the order on the said information, within one week thereafter.

43. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) for completion of service and pleadings on **22.09.2025**.

44. List before the Court on **21.01.2026**.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

AUGUST 11, 2025/msh/AM