



\$~45

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

+ **CS(OS) 959/2025**

RMSI PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mrs. Avnish Ahlawat, Mr. N.K. Singh, Ms. Palak Rohmetra, Ms. Tania Ahlawat, Mr. Uday Singh Ahlawat and Mr. Nishant Rewalia, Advocates.

versus

MR. SUDHANSHU DWIVEDI AND ORS

.....Defendants

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **30.01.2026**

I.A. 32756/2025 (under Section 151 CPC seeking exemption from filing original/certified and clean/typed copies of documents)

1. This is an application on behalf of the plaintiff seeking exemption from filing certified/original documents.
2. The application is allowed, subject to the plaintiff granting inspection of the documents, as and when, he is required to do so, or filing the original documents at the stage of admission/denial.
3. The application stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 959/2025

1. The plaint be registered as suit.
2. On filing of process fee, summons be issued to the defendants by all permissible modes.



3. 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 plaintiff, failing which the written statement shall not be taken on record.
4. 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.
5. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.
6. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.
7. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of service, pleadings, admission/denial of documents and marking of exhibits on 27.03.2026.
8. List before Court after completion of pleadings on 13.04.2026.

I.A. 32755/2025 (under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC for grant of ad interim injunction)

9. Issue notice to the defendants by all permissible modes.
10. The plaintiff has filed the present suit *inter alia* praying for decree of permanent injunction and damages.
11. The case set out in the plaint is that plaintiff is a reputed multinational geospatial and engineering solutions company with over 33 years of market presence, more than 5000 skilled professionals and operations across seven countries. It is further stated that the plaintiff has consistently been recognised by its employees as a good employer, offering a positive and



conducive work environment.

12. Ms. Avnish Ahlawat, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff, submits that defendant no. 1 was employed as an Analyst (Annotator) pursuant to the appointment letter dated 14.06.2024 and in furtherance of the same his employment with the plaintiff company commenced on 18.06.2024. The defendant no. 2 is LinkedIn (LinkedIn Technology Information Pvt. Ltd.) and defendant no. 3 is X (X Corp, formerly known as Twitter).

13. She submits that defendant no. 1, during his tenure, remained present for only 14.5 days till 12.09.2024. On 12.09.2024, he tendered his resignation citing personal and health issues. The plaintiff accepted the resignation and required him to serve two-month notice period, which the defendant no. 1 denied. In view of the same, the plaintiff terminated his employment w.e.f 09.09.2024 *vide* termination letter dated 27.09.2024.

14. She further submits that pursuant to the termination letter dated 27.09.2024, the defendant no. 1 approached the plaintiff in October, 2024 requesting that all supporting documents with regard to full and final settlement be shared with the defendant no. 1, which were readily made available to the defendant no. 1 *vide* email dated 29.10.2024. Additionally, the following documents were also furnished to the defendant no. 1:

- i. Salary slips from June 2024 to September 2024 along with month wise attendance & payment details from 18.06.2024 i.e. joining date of defendant no. 1 till 09.09.2024 i.e. last working date of defendant no. 1.
- ii. Absenteeism letter dated 17.09.2024 issued by the plaintiff to defendant no. 1.



- iii. Termination letter dated 27.09.2024 issued by the plaintiff to the defendant.
- iv. Copy of full and final settlement sheet, having recovery of Rs. 1,31,767/- against failure to serve the notice period.
- v. Plaintiff's bank account details for making the said payment in lieu of notice period.

However, the defendant no. 1 failed to either revert on the said email or pay the amount in lieu of the non serving of notice period.

15. She submits that nearly one year after the termination of defendant no. 1, he launched a series of false, malicious and defamatory attacks on the plaintiff, its group companies, directors, associates, partners, management and legal representatives on platforms such as LinkedIn and X (previously Twitter) starting on 16.09.2025 and continuing on a daily basis. The said posts falsely allege that the plaintiff has cheated defendant no. 1, committed forgery and fraud in conspiracy with its legal advisors.

16. She contends that the allegations made in the posts are entirely false, malicious and intended solely to harass and defame the plaintiff. Furthermore, the defendant no. 1 has openly threatened the legal advisors of the plaintiff that he will continue to publish the defamatory posts on various social media platforms.

17. She further submits that even after multiple attempts of the plaintiff to clarify the doubts pertaining to the termination, attendance, swipe-in and swipe-out details that defendant no. 1 allegedly had, the defendant no. 1 never bothered to contact the plaintiff. On the contrary, the defendant no. 1 initiated and continued to level false, libellous and defamatory imputations, insinuations and innuendos maligning the reputation of the plaintiff.



18. She emphasizes the fact the plaintiff's Human Resource Department has no role in marking, altering, or modifying attendance. The payroll is generated strictly on the basis of data captured by the automated punching system. Any absence reflected in the system is based entirely on objective access-card data and involves no discretion or manual intervention on part of the plaintiff.

19. She invites the attention of this Court to the list of URLs, wherein the defamatory posts have been published by the defendant no. 1 maligning the image of the plaintiff and contends that there is no semblance of truth in the posts published by the defendant no. 1.

20. She submits that the defendant no. 1 has also tagged the business associates and partners of the plaintiff along with media persons and law firms in the defamatory posts, thereby showing his intent to malign the image and reputation of the plaintiff without producing even a shred of evidence to substantiate his allegations against the plaintiff.

21. To buttress her contentions, she places reliance on the decision of this Court in ***Dhanya Rajendran and Anr. v. Galaxy Zoom India Pvt. Ltd. And Ors.*** 2024 SCC OnLine Del 4912.

22. I have opened the accessible links provided by the plaintiff and perused the LinkedIn posts dated 17.10.2025, 24.10.2025, 28.10.2025, 30.10.2025, 02.11.2025, 04.11.2025, 07.11.2025 and 10.11.2025, as well as, the post on X dated 31.10.2025. *Prima facie*, I find that there is substance in the submissions made by Ms. Ahlawat that the posts published by the defendant no. 1 on social media platforms LinkedIn (defendant no. 2) and X (defendant no. 3) contains defamatory and libellous allegations and insinuations, made in a reckless manner, to injure the reputation of the



plaintiff.

23. Illustratively, perusal of the posts published on LinkedIn shows that the defendant no. 1 has, *inter alia*, alleged that the plaintiff has manipulated attendance data, generated false salary slips and subsequently attempted to recover fictitious overpayments. The defendant no. 1 has categorically stated that the plaintiff has committed forgery, salary and conspiratorial financial fraud. He goes on to state that owing to the manipulation of attendance data and forgery of salary slip, the plaintiff has committed an offence under section 336 (3) of BNS, 2023. Furthermore, the defendant no. 1 asserts that if the plaintiff can resort to such misconduct against an employee, there remains no assurance that the plaintiff would refrain from similar fraudulent practices with its business partners and associates.

24. Likewise, perusal of the post published on X dated 31.10.2025 also reveals that similar allegations of fraud and forgery have been made by the defendant no. 1 against the plaintiff.

25. It is also pertinent to note that through these posts published by defendant no. 1, he has also accused the legal advisors of the plaintiff, namely Ahlawat & Associates, of professional misconduct and involvement in cheating and conspiratorial financial fraud.

26. At this juncture apt would be to refer to a decision of the coordinate bench of this Court in ***Mahaveer Singhvi v. Hindustan Times Limited, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 4409*** wherein after referring to various decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as of other High Courts, following principal ingredients of the civil law of defamation were culled out:—

“(i) Publication of a statement (concerning the aggrieved plaintiff) exposing the plaintiff to hatred, ridicule, or contempt



or which causes him to be shunned or avoided or which has a tendency to injure him in his office, profession or calling;

(ii) Harm caused to the plaintiffs' reputation and not the intention of the defendant is material; that the defendant had no intention to defame the plaintiff, is irrelevant;

(iii) The statement must be published by the defendant to a third person; and

(iv) The statement must be false. The defences available especially in the context of newspaper publications are a truthful statement, fair comment for public good and privileged statements cannot attract civil liability."

(emphasis supplied)

27. Similarly, a coordinate bench of this court in ***Lakshmi Murdeshwar Puri v. Saket Gokhale (2021) 3 HCC (Del) 23*** held as under:

"29. Reputations, nourished and nurtured over years of selfless service and toil, may crumble in an instant; one thoughtless barb is sufficient. It has been held, by the Supreme Court, that the right to life, consecrated by Article 21 of the Constitution of India, infuses the reputation of the individual. [Mehmood Nayyar Azam v. State of Chhattisgarh, (2012) 8 SCC 1; Kiran Bedi v. Committee of Inquiry, (1989) 1 SCC 494; Port of Bombay v. Dilipkumar Raghavendranath Nadkarni, (1983) 1 SCC 124] Reputation, it is well settled, precedes the man. In a similar vein, para 18 of the report in Institute of Chartered Accountants of India v. L.K. Ratna [Institute of Chartered Accountants of India v. L.K. Ratna, (1986) 4 SCC 537] observes thus:

"For instance, as in the present case, where a member of a highly respected an (sic) publicly trusted profession is found guilty of misconduct and suffers penalty, the damage to his professional reputation can be immediate and far-reaching. 'Not all the King's horses and all the King's men' can ever salvage the situation completely, notwithstanding the widest scope provided to an appeal. To many a man, his professional reputation is his most valuable possession. It affects his standing and dignity among his fellow members



in the profession, and guarantees the esteem of his clientele. It is often the carefully garnered fruit of a long period of scrupulous, conscientious and diligent industry. It is the portrait of his professional honour. In a world said to be notorious for its blase attitude towards the noble values of an earlier generation, a man's professional reputation is still his most sensitive pride. In such a case, after the blow suffered by the initial decision, it is difficult to contemplate complete restitution through an appellate decision.”

30. In the age of social media, desecration of the reputation of a public figure has become child's play. All that is needed is the opening of a social media account and, thereafter, the posting of messages on the account. Thousands of responses are received and, in the process, the reputation of the man, who is targeted, becomes mud...”

(emphasis supplied)

28. Having noticed the aforesaid *dicta* as well as material on record, I am of *prima facie* view that the allegations in the aforementioned posts published by defendant no. 1 on the platforms LinkedIn (defendant no. 2) and X (defendant no. 3) are not based on any credible and reliable sources for making out a case that the said allegations are true and based on facts. Further, such allegations do not seem to be premised on a public record document such as any criminal case registered or pending against the plaintiff. The defendant no. 1 has only used the social media platforms to vent out his grievances against the plaintiff without premising the same on any conclusive evidence.

29. Further, tagging of business associates and partners of the plaintiff along with the media persons and law firms clearly show that the defendant no. 1 wants to sensationalize the defamatory posts to gain traction, which cannot be countenanced at the cost of reputational damage to the plaintiff.

30. Since the plaintiff is a reputed multinational geospatial and



engineering solutions company with over 33 years of market presence, I am satisfied that the plaintiff will suffer irreparable loss and injury in case an *ad interim* order of injunction in favour of the plaintiff is not granted. The balance of convenience is also in favour of an interim order of *status quo* being passed.

31. Under the circumstances, it is deemed appropriate to direct the defendant no. 1 not to publish any post making identical or similar defamatory allegations against the plaintiff, till the next date of hearing. Ordered accordingly. Further, the defendant no. 1 is directed to take down/remove the defamatory posts published on the social media platforms, namely LinkedIn (defendant no. 2) and X (defendant no. 3), which is tabulated below, and maintain that position, till the next date of hearing.

S. No.	URL/Links
1.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_substantiatedinformation-conclusivewitness-activity-7384386576711270401-stBB?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
2.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_knowledgesharing-practicaexample-humanresource-activity-7387398666585665536-06Pc?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
3.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_knowledgesharing-practicaexample-humanresource-activity-7387398666585665536-06Pc?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM



	activity-7388818534392422400-iiwD?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
4.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_postno-rmsi-rmsi-activity-7389516324546392064-eQb3?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
5.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_postno-incontinuation-postno-activity-7389523807314722816-VXoA?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
6.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_postno-incontinuationof-postno-activity-7389531840749158401-PpF6?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
7.	https://x.com/sudhans37897226/status/1984165925281743226?s=48&t=0gUBAhuFfittRKlfKa6EgA
8.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_partners-legalfirm-unethical-activity-7390713470742228992-3n9M?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
9.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-



	99ba14171_partners-legalfirm-unethical-activity-7391446742518525954-0KQx?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_android&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
10.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_partners-legalfirm-unethical-activity-7392507273971081216-C7um?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_android&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM
11.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_partners-legalfirm-unethical-activity-7392156913683095552-OpOj?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_android&rcm=ACoAACRae1MBLmH-wntN6-JXaGO54KjLr_Sr0is
12.	https://www.linkedin.com/posts/sudhanshu-dwivedi-99ba14171_overpayment-theory-client-activity-7393532579024498689-cKqg?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member_desktop&rcm=ACoAACiN0HgBqHrWWx6GehmrCjsFcsbX2v01mDM

32. Provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC be complied with by the plaintiff within a period of three weeks from today and affidavit of compliance be filed within a period of one week thereafter.

33. Let reply to the application be filed within a period of 04 weeks.

34. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks thereafter.



35. List before the learned Joint Registrar for completion of service and pleadings on 27.03.2026.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 30, 2026
N.S. ASWAL