

News

91% of the 29,118 removal requests were fulfilled: X Corp to the Karnataka High Court on the Sahyog site dispute .



X Corp claims that a High Court single-judge's judgment in his September 24 ruling that the platform seeks to disrespect Indian law is contradicted by its compliance record.

According to X Corp's testimony before the Karnataka High Court, it received 29,118 requests for post removal from the Indian government between January and June 2025, and it cooperated with 26,641 of them, resulting in a 91.49% compliance rate [X Corp Vs Union of India].

As a result, X Corp claims that its compliance record refutes the conclusion made by a High Court single judge in his September 24 ruling that the platform seeks to disrespect Indian law.

The numbers were included in its writ appeal against the High Court's September 24 ruling, in which a single judge supported the legitimacy of the Central government's Sahyog portal, an internet platform that allows web intermediaries like X to receive material takedown orders.

According to X Corp's appeal, the use of Rule 3(1)(d) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (2021 IT Rules) and Section 79(3)(b) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act) by different government agencies to issue takedown notices amounts to the establishment of an illegal parallel regime that circumvents the statutory and constitutionally validated procedure outlined under Section 69A of the IT Act.

The social media behemoth claims that the only legal framework in India for imposing information blocking orders is Section 69A and the 2009 Blocking Rules that go along with it.

According to X Corp's appeal, this procedure, which the Supreme Court supported in *Shreya Singhal v. Union of India* (2015), contains many protections and mandates that orders be granted only in certain, limited circumstances under Article 19(2) of the Constitution.

On the other hand, Section 79 does not provide the government any independent authority to issue blocking orders; rather, it is only a "exemption provision" designed to protect intermediaries from liability.

According to X Corp's argument, the government is abusing Section 79(3)(b) and Rule 3(1)(d), which requires intermediaries to delete any information that is now illegal.

Among the main issues brought up by X Corp are:

Delegation of Power: Tens of thousands of executive officers and police officers from all central ministries and state governments were instructed in a memo dated October 31, 2023, by MeitY (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology) to issue blocking orders directly under Section 79(3)(b) and Rule 3(1)(d), avoiding the Section 69A procedure.

"Sahyog" Portal: In order to enable the issuance of these illegal blocking orders

without parliamentary support or transparency, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) established a covert, private web portal known as the "Sahyog" (Censorship Portal) at MeitY's request. The petition claims that this portal is a colorful attempt to usurp judicial powers and an unlawful use of executive power.

Arbitrary Censorship: Under Rule 3(1)(d), State police (e.g., Satara, West Bengal, Bihar, Chennai) and Central ministries (e.g., Ministry of Railways) have frequently issued blocking orders to restrict legitimate criticism of public officials, news reports, political speech, and parody content on grounds that are consistent with but do not fall under Section 69A's protections.

Lack of Safeguards: The single-judge order ignored the fact that Rule 3(1)(d) lacks the comprehensive procedural and substantive safeguards found in Section 69A, which violates Article 14 (right to equality) and makes Section 69A useless because the same information can be blocked under a less favorable and arbitrary procedure.

The solitary judge's failure to apply and adhere to the Supreme Court's binding precedent in Shreya Singhal is one of the main arguments put out by X Corp.

Because the 2021 IT Rules superseded the 2011 IT Rules, the single judge mistakenly concluded that Shreya Singhal was restricted or no longer relevant.

According to the petition, Section 69A, Section 79, and the 2009 Blocking Rules—the cornerstones of the Shreya Singhal ruling—remain unaltered.