



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO.30690 OF 2025
IN
SUIT (L) NO.30688 OF 2025

Malabar Gold And Diamonds LimitedApplicant
IN THE MATTER BETWEEN	
Malabar Gold And Diamonds LimitedPlaintiff
V/S	
Meta Platforms Inc	
(operating digital platforms	
such as Instagram, Facebook and	
Whatsapp) & Ors.Defendants

Mr. Naushad Engineer, Senior Advocate (through video conferencing) with Mr. Amrut Joshi, Mr. Premlal Krishnan, Mr. Uazad Udwadia, Mr. Rehmat Lokhandwala and Mr. Abuzar Khan i/b M/s. Pan India Legal *for the Applicant/Plaintiff*.

Mr. Harit Lakhani with Mr. Varun Pathak, Mr. Amee Rama, Mr. Vishesh Sharma, Ms. Richa Bharti and Ms. Anannya Gogoi i/b M/s. Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas & Co. *for Defendant No.1*.

Ms. Tanvi Rana (through video conferencing) i/b M/s. Economic Laws Practice *for Defendant No.3*.

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.
DATE : 29 SEPTEMBER 2025.

P.C.:

1. Plaintiff is a reputed jewellery brand operating in India and is engaged in manufacturing and trading of jewellery.
2. It is Plaintiff's case that it had plans to establish a new show-room at Birmingham in United Kingdom (UK). In order to promote the said

show-room and to attract prospective customers from adjoining localities, Plaintiff had engaged social media influencers as a part of its marketing strategy. Accordingly, Defendant No.8 (JAB Studios) was engaged for the purpose of securing services *inter alia* of social influencers. It appears that one of the principal influencers provided by Defendant No.8 for promoting Plaintiff's show-room in Birmingham, UK was Ms. Alishba Khalid, a Pakistani Instagram Influencer, who is a resident of UK. It appears that the said influencer had publicly condemned India's surgical strike during Operation Sindoor against Pakistan. However, according to Plaintiff, the arrangement for engagement of Ms. Alishba Khalid, social influencer had taken much prior to the Pahalgam attack. According to Plaintiff, engagement of Ms. Alishba Khalid was done in absence of knowledge on the part of the Plaintiff about her connections with the neighbouring country.

3. The problem that the Plaintiff now faces is that several posts/materials/stories are being posted on social media platforms against the Plaintiff by random persons seeking to connect the Plaintiff with the neighbouring country. On account of Plaintiff hiring services of social influencer criticizing India's Operation Sindoor, it is being portrayed through such posts that Plaintiff is a sympathizer of Pakistan. Plaintiff contends that this is being done strategically at the instance of competitors so as to ensure that Plaintiff's business during festive times suffer. At Exhibit-J to the plaint, Plaintiff has provided list of 442 URLs containing defamatory posts against the Plaintiff. Plaintiff has accordingly sought injunction against the Defendants from publishing any further defamatory contents against it and for removal of contents which are already published on the social media platforms.

4. I have heard Mr. Engineer, the learned Senior Advocate appearing for the Plaintiff and I have considered the submissions canvassed by him. I have also heard Mr. Lakhani, the learned counsel appearing for Defendant No.1 and Ms. Rana, the learned counsel appearing for Defendant No.3. None appears on behalf of the rest of the Defendants though being served privately.

5. It is Plaintiff's case that mere utilization of services of the UK based social influencer by it at some point of time cannot be a reason for spreading defamatory contents by the competitors. Mr. Engineer has submitted that Plaintiff has discontinued the services of the said influencer. He further submits that Plaintiff cannot be connected to the activities of the influencer, especially considering that the posts by her are subsequent to her engagement by Plaintiff. Considering the submissions canvassed by Mr. Engineer, in my view, a case is made out for grant of ad-interim injunction in favour of the Plaintiff for pulling down the posts, list of which alongwith URL is already provided at Exhibit-J to the plaintiff. Similarly, the Defendant Nos.1 to 7 on whose platforms defamatory material is being published against the Plaintiff, deserves to be restrained from permitting publication of any further defamatory material against the Plaintiff *qua the* influencer arrangement made by it with Ms. Alishba Khalid.

6. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, there shall be an ad-interim protection in favour of the Plaintiff in terms of the following order:

- i) Defendant Nos.1 to 7 shall pull down and delete all the posts/materials/stories details of which are reflected in the chart at Exhibit-J to the plaintiff;

ii) Defendant Nos.1 to 7 shall not permit publishing of any further defamatory material against the Plaintiff *qua* the arrangement made by the Plaintiff for engagement of Ms. Alishba Khalid as a social influencer to promote its products and business.

iii) For the purpose of complying with the direction in (ii) above, Plaintiff shall provide the details of URLs to Defendant Nos.1 to 7 in respect of posts/materials/stories containing any defamatory material arising out of Plaintiff's engagement of Ms. Alishba Khalid as social influencer. In case Defendant Nos.1 to 7 have any doubts/defamation regarding any of the URLs reported by the Plaintiff, they shall inform the Plaintiff of the same, in which case, Plaintiff shall be entitled to approach this Court and seek appropriate relief in respect of those URLs.

iv) Defendant No.6 is restrained from publishing any printed material against the Plaintiff *qua* the arrangement made by it with Ms. Alishba Khalid as a social influencer.

7. The above directions shall operate as ad-interim injunction in Plaintiff's favour till next date.

8. Issue Court notices to Defendant Nos.2, 4 to 8, returnable on 11 November 2025.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

Digitally signed
by
SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Date:
2025.09.30
11:00:11 +0530