CS DJ No. 75/26
GURUJI KA ASHRAM TRUST v. MOLITICS INFOMEDIA PRIVATE LIMITED

24.01.2026

Fresh suit received by way of assignment.
It be checked and registered as per rules.

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kapur, Ms. Manmeet Kaur, Mr. Gurtej Pal Singh, Mr. Rose Verma, Mr. Saurav Mishra, Mr. Saurabh Jha, and Mr. Jai Dogra, Ld. Counsels for the plaintiff.

1. Plaintiff, *Guruji Ka Ashram Trust* has filed this suit for several reliefs of permanent injunction, mandatory and prohibitory; and damages for defamation.

2. I have heard Mr. Sandeep Kapur, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff, perused the judicial record and considered the same.

3. Plaintiff is seeking aforesaid reliefs in connection with a video, which it claims to be defamatory, and which has allegedly been uploaded by the defendant no.1 and 2 on the YouTube platform, owned and operated by defendant no.3 and 4. Defendant no.5, John Doe/Ashok Kumar, is stated to be unknown person(s).

4. Plaintiff, which claims to be a Public Charitable Trust, being not a juristic entity, cannot institute this suit in its name alone. Therefore, in exercise of powers under Order I Rule 10(1) CPC, it is directed that the cause title/memo of parties be amended by mentioning plaintiff as "*Guruji Ka Ashram Trust,* through its Trustee (name)".

5. Let summons for settlement of issues as per Order V Rule 9 of CPC, 1908 be issued to the defendants through ordinary service and RC/speed post, upon plaintiff taking steps within 7 days, returnable on **26.02.2026**.

Application for exemption from filing Court fees:

6. The plaintiff, by way of captioned application, is seeking exemption from paying the Court fees.

7. Heard, perused and considered.

8. The aforesaid exemption is being sought on the ground that the plaintiff trust has been formed for charitable purpose without any profit motive.

9. In this regard, the Delhi High Court in ***Sahara India Airlines Limited*** *v. R.A. Singh,* **MANU/DE/0527/1997** has held: (i) that Section 4 of the Court Fees Act, 1870 as applied to Delhi puts a complete embargo on the power of the Court to proceed with or act upon a document of any kind including a plaint in the suit unless it bears the prescribed court fees; (ii) though Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC empowers the Court to, in cases of grave injustice or hardship, extend time for payment of court fees, but neither the Court Fees Act nor the CPC empower the Court to grant exemption from payment of prescribed court fees; (iii) the law also does not provide for deferment of payment of court fees till the decision of the suit and recovery thereof from the decretal amount; (iv) if the plaintiff is unable to pay the court fees, the only course available is to apply to sue as an indigent person; (v) else, a suit cannot be tried without payment of court fees; even the proviso to Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC does not permit deferment of payment of court fees till the decision of the suit.

10. In view of the above, the captioned application is liable to be dismissed. Ordered accordingly.

11. Plaintiff is directed to deposit the requisite Court fees within two weeks.

Additional District Judge-03 (SE) Saket Court, New Delhi

Application under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 CPC:

12. Mr. Kapur for the plaintiff has pressed upon the captioned application for passing of an *ex-parte* ad-interim injunction Order on the ground of urgency.

13. Heard, perused and considered.

14. Mr. Kapur submits that the plaintiff is a Registered Public Charitable Trust, which was formed and settled by "*Guruji*" with philanthropic objectives. He submits that the plaintiff have earned an enormous goodwill and reputation. He submits that on 15.01.2026, the defendant no.1, which owns and operates a YouTube channel, "Molitics" uploaded a video with the title, "Jai Guru Ji के भक्त ठगी, बलात्कार, और फ्रॉड में शामिल है ? । Fraud Baba by Neeraj Jha". He then submits that the defendant no.1 has also used the disparaging and defamatory words such as "*loot*", "*thagi*", "*fraud baba*" *and* "*balatkaar*" in the thumbnail of the said video. Lastly, he submits that the impugned video is causing grave harm to the reputation and goodwill of plaintiff, its late founder, *Guruji,* his followers and Trustees in the eyes of public at large. Basis these submissions, Ld. Counsel submits that the defendant no.1, 2 and other unknown persons may be restrained from publishing or sharing the impugned video; that the said defendants may further be restrained from publishing any defamatory material against the plaintiff or its late founder, or its devotees; and lastly, that the defendant no. 3 and 4 may be directed to take down the impugned video from YouTube.

15. I have watched the impugned video which has been filed in the form of a pendrive with the plaint. In the said video, which is of 17 minutes duration, *per se* defamatory terms, such as "*loot*", "*thagi*", "*fraud baba*" *and* "*balatkaar*" have been uttered. Further, a screenshot of thumbnail of the impugned video as pasted in the plaint is being

reproduced:

16. The aforesaid picture on the face of it is found to be *prima facie* disparaging and defamatory to plaintiff and its Trustees.

17. Defamation is an injury to a person's reputation. Every person has a right to maintain and preserve his reputation un-assailed. The law of defamation protects the reputation. A person's reputation, which is her precious possession, can not always be measured in terms of money.

18. In the present case, the alleged defamatory video has been uploaded on a social media platform, YouTube, which can be accessed by any person in the world and the impugned video can also be shared to several thousands of persons all over the world by a few clicks.

19. The plaintiff has raised serious questions, which are to be decided during hearing of the suit. In case, plaintiff is successful in establishing its case, it would be entitled to the reliefs sought. The Court is, thus, satisfied about *prima facie* case aspect. The Court is also of the view that the prejudice, which the plaintiff would suffer if the impugned video is allowed to be published/circulated on the internet, would be greater than the one, which would be caused to the defendants, if they are injuncted. The injury to the reputation, being not measurable in terms of money, would be irreparable.

20. The Court is also satisfied that the delay which would be caused in serving the defendants would defeat the very purpose of seeking the urgent injunction reliefs. Therefore, following *ex-parte* ad-interim injunction directions are being passed:

(a) Defendant no.3/4 are directed to take down/remove/delete within 2 days the URL/videos/photo uploaded/published on YouTube : https://www.youtube.com/watched?v=kLBu-dsCLew;

(b) The defendant no.1 and 2, and their officials, associates, agents, employees, or any other person on their behalf are restrained from publishing/ circulating, directly or indirectly, any defamatory material of the nature, which is the subject matter of the present suit, till the next date of hearing;

(c) As the unknown persons, who have been sharing/republishing the impugned video are yet to be identified, and the danger of harm to plaintiff's reputation is so imminent that the very purpose of injunction might be defeated, therefore, all such persons are also restrained from sharing/republishing the impugned video.

21. The plaintiff shall file a compliance affidavit in terms of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC within 7 days from today.

22. At request, a *dasti* copy of this Order be given to the plaintiff/Ld. Counsel.

—Sd—

(Sachin Mittal)
DJ-03/South-East District
Saket Courts, New Delhi/24.01.2026

District Judge-03,
(South-East) Saket Court New Delhi