



\$~11

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

+ **CS(OS) 920/2025, I.A. 31563/2025 & I.A. 2130/2026**

YASHOVARDHAN AZAD

.....Plaintiff

Through: Dr. Divya Swamy, Mr. Yagyawalkya Singh, Mr. Rishav Ranjan, Mr. Sudepp Chandra, Ms. Akriti Singh and Ms. Ananya Y., Advs.

Mob: 9534251489

Email: rishav@dylawchambers.com

versus

SANJU VERMA

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Raghav Awasthi, Ms. Simran Brar, Ms. Ruhi Ansari and Mr. Fateh Singh Majithia, Advs.

Mob: 8826877415

Email: officesbk123@gmail.com

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

27.01.2026

I.A. 31563/2025 (Application under Order XXXIX Rule 2 and 3 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ("CPC"))

1. After some hearing, without going into the merits of the case of the parties with regard to the defamatory nature of the Tweets, both the parties are *ad idem* that they will archive the Tweets referring to each other.
2. Let the needful be done, within a period of one week, from today.
3. The issue as to whether the Tweets made by the defendant against the plaintiff are defamatory in nature, are subject matter of adjudication, which shall be considered at the time of final adjudication of the matter.



4. It is clarified that today's consent order shall not be considered as any concession on the part of the plaintiff.

5. At this stage, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that all the Tweets made by the plaintiff were only in defense of the various Tweets that were made on behalf of the defendant.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the defendant submits that the Tweets were made as a result of an exchange after a national debate, where both the parties had expressed their opinions. However, he submits that as on today, the defendant does not wish to make any further Tweets against the plaintiff.

7. Responding to this, learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff submits that, in case, no Tweets are made by the defendant against the plaintiff, the plaintiff shall not make any comments on the social media platforms against the defendant.

8. The aforesaid statements are taken note of and both the parties are held bound by it.

I.A. 2130/2026 (Application under Order VII Rule 11 of CPC)

9. The present application has been filed on behalf of the defendant, seeking rejection of the plaint under Order VII Rule 11, read with Section 151 of the CPC.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the defendant relies upon the judgment dated 20th February, 2025, passed by this Court, in the case of "*Addictive Learning Technology Limited & Anr. Versus Aditya Garg & Ors.*", CS(OS) 570/2024, and in particular, relies upon Paragraph 17.16, wherein, it was held as under:

"xxx xxx xxx

17.16 The delay on the part of the plaintiffs in approaching this Court



after more than a month of posting of the said impugned tweets further shows that plaintiffs did not perceive that the impugned tweets at the contemporary time had caused any legal injury to them or their reputation. The plaintiffs failed to avail the statutory remedy available to them under the IT Rules of 2021 immediately or any time thereafter. This court is therefore of the opinion that the pleas of defamation now raised in the plaint are without any merit and therefore, the plaint qua defendant no. 1 is without any cause of action.

xxx xxx xxx”

11. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff.
12. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks, from today.
13. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks, thereafter.
14. List on 07th May, 2026.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/SK