



Luthra *and* Luthra
LAW OFFICES INDIA

TECH LITIGATION

Newsletter – December 2025 Edition





INSIDE

- **The Ministry of Information & Broadcasting issues Draft Accessibility Guidelines for OTT Platforms**
- **The SEBI issues a draft circular on disclosure by SEBI-Regulated Entities on Social Media Platforms**
- **The MeitY notifies the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025**
- **Apple challenges India's global turnover-based antitrust penalty framework**
- **The MeitY amends the IT Rules, 2021, to enhance safeguards for content removal by intermediaries**
- **The MeitY amends and notifies Designated Officers under Section 69A, following the IT Rules Amendment, 2025**
- **MeitY issues SOP on curbing circulation of non-consensual intimate imagery content**
- **The SEBI engages with digital platforms to reinforce investor protection framework**
- **Judicial trend in the Personality Rights**
- **Kerala High Court mandates the use of AI for witness deposition**



1. The Ministry of Information & Broadcasting issues Draft Accessibility Guidelines for OTT Platforms

The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (“MIB”) has recently issued draft *Guidelines for Accessibility of Content on platforms of publishers of Online Curated Content (OTT Platforms) for Persons with Hearing and Visual Impairment* (“**Draft Accessibility Guidelines**”). The proposed guidelines seek to ensure that online curated content is accessible to persons with disabilities in line with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, to which India is a signatory. It also aligns with the Accessible India Campaign, also known as the ‘*Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan*’, which seeks to enable persons with disabilities to gain universal access. Further, the Draft Accessibility Guidelines build on the foundation laid by the Code of Ethics for Over-The-Top platforms (“**OTT Platforms**”) under the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (“**Code of Ethics**”). While the Code of Ethics provides that every OTT Platform shall, to the extent feasible, take reasonable efforts to improve the accessibility of online curated content through the implementation of appropriate access services, the Draft Accessibility Guidelines impose detailed, time-bound and enforceable accessibility obligations.

Applicability

The Draft Accessibility Guidelines apply to online curated content across all OTT platforms. However, the following types of content are exempt from the accessibility requirements:

- i. Live and deferred live content
- ii. Audio-only content, including music tracks, podcasts, and similar formats.
- iii. Short-form content.

Implementation

Once notified, the Draft Accessibility Guidelines are proposed to be implemented in a phased manner as provided below:

Phase I:

Publishers of online curated content shall, upon expiry of six months of the date of publication of the guidelines:

- i. ensure that all new content carries at least one accessibility feature for hearing impaired and visually impaired viewers, namely Closed Captioning (“**CC**”) and Open Captioning (“**OC**”) and Audio Descriptors (“**AD**”) or Indian Sign Language (“**ISL**”);
- ii. prominently display, at the time of release, content descriptors indicating the accessibility features, including for promotional audio-visual material; and
- iii. integrate and make functional the accessibility features across user interfaces of their platforms.



Phase II

Publishers of online curated content are encouraged to provide at least one accessibility feature for hearing-impaired and visually-impaired users, namely CC/OC and AD/ISL progressively to all the content in their content libraries. Towards this objective, publishers shall strive to achieve the following milestones:

- i. not less than 30% of the total content library within twelve months;
- ii. not less than 60% of the total content library within eighteen months; and
- iii. 100% of the total content library within twenty-four months of publication of these guidelines.

AD & ISL Guidelines

Publishers of online curated content shall strive to make available AD of the audio-visual content for its users in a concise, comprehensible format to fit within the allotted time, enhancing the original piece without causing distractions.

ISL interpretation by interpreters must be provided in a picture-in-picture mode, and it must be accurate, synchronised and convey a clear message to persons with hearing impairments. Where ISL is provided, it should be in a manner that the viewer can see not only the hands but also the facial expressions of the interpreter. The image of the interpreter superimposed upon the original film should generally appear on the bottom right-hand side of the screen.

CC and OC Guidelines

The CC and OC should be accurate, synchronised and complete. Further, the captions should not block other important visual content on the screen, overlap one another or run off the edge of the video screen. Additionally, the Draft Accessibility Guidelines also suggest that the captions must use mixed case, i.e., using all upper caps or all lowercase for captioning text should not be done unless it is critically required for understanding the video.

The Draft Accessibility Guidelines were open for public comments until October 22, 2025, and the guidelines are expected to be released soon.

2. The SEBI issues a draft circular on disclosure by SEBI-Regulated Entities on Social Media Platforms.

On November 28, 2025, the Securities and Exchange Board of India (“SEBI”) released a consultation paper, proposing a draft circular titled “*Disclosure of registered name and registration number by SEBI regulated entities and their agents on Social Media Platforms*” (“**Draft Social Media Circular**”).

The Draft Social Media Circular notes that in order to enhance investor protection and to prevent misleading online financial promotions, it is essential to clearly differentiate content uploaded by SEBI-regulated entities (“**Regulated Entities**”) on social media platforms (“**SMPs**”) from content posted by unregistered individuals. This measure is intended to strengthen the monitoring of online content and promote transparency.



As per the Draft Social Media Circular, all persons regulated by the Board and their agents (mutual fund distributors, distributors of portfolio management services, etc.) shall prominently disclose their registered name and registration number on the home page of their social media channels as well as alongside each of the videos/content uploaded by them so that the viewer/user is able to identify that the content uploaded on the SMP is uploaded by a SEBI regulated entity or its agent.

Further, the Draft Social Media Circular prohibits Regulated Entities and their authorised agents from uploading the following content on SMPs:

- i. Anything that is prohibited for publication under law.
- ii. Statements which are false, misleading, biased or deceptive.
- iii. Statements which, directly or by implication or by omission, may mislead the investor.
- iv. Any statement designed to exploit the lack of experience or knowledge of the investors.
- v. Any statement that is exaggerated or is inconsistent with or unrelated to the nature and risk, and return profile of the product being talked about/referred to in the content.
- vi. Any promise or guarantee of assured or risk-free return to the investors, either directly or in an implied manner.
- vii. Reference to past performance of the entity, unless permitted by SEBI to make such reference.
- viii. SEBI Logo/ reference to any SEBI office or officer.
- ix. References/ links (directly or indirectly) or any association (direct/indirect) with any other person who, directly or indirectly, provides advice or recommendation, in respect of or related to security (ies) or makes any implicit or explicit claim of return or performance, in respect of or related to security (ies) unless permitted by the Board to provide such advice/ recommendation/claim.

3. The MeitY notifies the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025

On November 14, 2025, MeitY formally notified the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 (“**DPDP Rules**”), thereby operationalising the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (“**DPDP Act**”) and providing the detailed regulatory framework for how digital personal data must be processed, stored, transferred and protected in India.

This marks a major shift in India’s data-security regime, replacing the Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011 (“**SPDI Rules**”) under the Information Technology Act, 2000 (“**IT Act**”) and establishes a comprehensive statutory framework governing the processing of digital personal data. The DPDP Act and the DPDP Rules have extraterritorial application, i.e., if a foreign entity offers goods or services to individuals in India or processes their data for such purposes, the DPDP Act can apply.

The DPDP Act introduces clearly defined roles for different entities under the Act. It also lays down obligations centred on consent, purpose limitation, data minimisation, security safeguards and accountability.

Key Terms under the Act:



- i. **Data Fiduciary:** An entity that decides why and how personal data is processed, either alone or with others. Every Data Fiduciary must issue a separate consent notice that is clear and easy to understand. The notice must explain the specific purpose for which personal data is collected and used.
- ii. **Data Principal:** The individual to whom the personal data relates. In the case of a child, this includes a parent or lawful guardian. For a person with a disability who cannot act independently, this includes the lawful guardian acting on their behalf.
- iii. **Data Processor:** Any entity that processes personal data on behalf of a Data Fiduciary.
- iv. **Consent Manager:** An entity that provides a single, transparent and interoperable platform through which a Data Principal may give, manage, review or withdraw consent. These Consent Managers, who help people manage their permissions, must be companies based in India.
- v. **Data Protection Board of India (“Board”):** the Board is a digital enforcement authority under the DPDP Act, wherein citizens will be able to file complaints online and track their cases through a dedicated portal and mobile application. The Board is responsible for adjudicating non-compliance, directing corrective action, and imposing penalties for non-compliance. In exercise of its powers under Section 19 of the DPDP Act, the Central Government, *vide* notification dated November 13, 2025, has also notified that the Board shall consist of four members.
- vi. **Appellate Tribunal:** The Telecom Disputes Settlement and Appellate Tribunal (“TDSAT”) is the appellate body for decisions of the Board.

Commencement of the DPDP Rules:

The DPDP Rules introduce an eighteen-month period for phased compliance. Rule 1 of the DPDP Rules provides for staggered commencement of the DPDP Rules in the following manner:

- i. Rule 1 on commencement of the DPDP Act, Rule 2 containing definitions, and Rules 17 to 21 pertaining to the functioning and administration of the Board shall come into force on the date of its publication of the DPDP Rules.
- ii. Rule 4 pertaining to registration and obligations of Consent Managers shall come into force within one year of the date of their publication of the DPDP Rules.
- iii. Rule 3 regarding the notice to be given by Data Fiduciaries to Data Principals, Rule 5 to 16 pertaining to the obligations of Data Fiduciaries, Rule 22 pertaining to the Appellate Tribunal, and Rule 23 regarding obligation of intermediaries shall come into force within eighteen months of the date of publication of the DPDP Rules.

This phased implementation gives organisations enough time to adjust their systems and adopt responsible data practices under the new regime.

4. Apple challenges India’s global turnover-based antitrust penalty framework

On November 26, 2025, Apple Inc. initiated legal proceedings before the Hon’ble Delhi High Court challenging the Competition (Amendment) Act 2023 (“**2023 Amendment**”) and the Monetary Penalty



Guidelines 2024 (“**Penalty Guidelines**”).¹ The 2023 Amendment allows the Competition Commission of India (“**CCI**”) to calculate antitrust penalties based on a company’s global turnover. This includes revenue earned outside India and revenue from business lines unrelated to the line of business where the alleged contravention occurred.

Thus, under the amended penalty framework, introduced through the 2023 Amendment, read with the Penalty Guidelines, the CCI is empowered to impose significantly higher fines on multinational corporations whose global operations far exceed their Indian market footprint. In Apple’s case, ongoing investigations into its App Store policies could expose the company to penalties reportedly estimated at up to USD 38 billion.

Before the 2023 Amendment, Section 27(b)(3) of the Competition Act, 2002 (“**Competition Act**”) empowered the CCI to impose penalties up to 10% of the average turnover for the preceding three financial years. However, the term “*turnover*” was not clearly explained in the Competition Act.

In *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. CCI*², the Hon’ble Supreme Court, had addressed this issue on “[w]hether penalty under Section 27(b) of the Act has to be on total/entire turnover of the offending company or it can be only on “*relevant turnover*”, i.e., relating to the product in question” and had held that, “it is the relevant turnover, i.e., turnover of the particular product which is to be taken into consideration and not total turnover of the violator.”³

However, post the 2023 Amendment, the word “turnover” in Section 27 of the Competition Act (i.e., in the penalizing section) has been defined as “[f]or the purposes of this clause, “turnover” means global turnover derived from all the products and services by a person or an enterprise.”

The challenge comes amid increased regulatory scrutiny of digital markets in India, with the CCI examining the competitive impact of Apple’s app store guidelines, in-app payment restrictions, and platform-led distribution models. Apple, however, maintains that its App Store policies are consistent with global practices and that any penalties should be calibrated to its operations within India, rather than its international business. The Hon’ble Delhi High Court is yet to examine the constitutional and legal basis of the amended penalty regime, a decision that could shape the future of competition enforcement against multinational technology companies in the country.

5. The MeitY amends the IT Rules, 2021, to enhance safeguards for content removal by intermediaries.

MeitY has notified the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Amendment Rules, 2025 (“**IT Amendment Rules, 2025**”), amending the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 (“**IT Rules, 2021**”), and they come into effect from November 15, 2025.

The IT Amendment Rules, 2025, amend Rule 3(1)(d) of IT Rules, 2021, introducing additional safeguards to ensure that removal of unlawful content by intermediaries is carried out in a transparent, proportionate, and accountable manner.

¹ *Apple Inc & Anr. vs Union of India & Anr.*, W.P.(C) 17934/2025

² *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. CCI*, (2017) 8 SCC 47

³ Para 93, *Excel Crop Care Ltd. v. CCI*, (2017) 8 SCC 47



Under the earlier Rule 3(1)(d) of IT Rules, 2021, an intermediary on whose computer resource any information used to commit an unlawful act, is hosted, must, upon receiving actual knowledge under Section 79(3)(b) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, (“IT Act”) remove or disable access to such information within thirty-six hours of receiving such “actual knowledge”. The amended provision, however, expressly narrows the scope of receiving “actual knowledge” to two specific modes:

- i. An order of a court of competent jurisdiction; or
- ii. A reasoned written intimation issued by an officer authorised by the “Appropriate Government” as defined under the IT Act or its agency for this purpose. Such an officer must not be below the rank of Joint Secretary or an equivalent rank, or, in the absence of such officer, a Director under the IT Act or equivalent rank officer to the Government of India or the State Government, as the case may be. In cases involving the police administration, the authorised officer must not be below the rank of Deputy Inspector General of Police, specifically empowered by the Appropriate Government for this purpose.

Further, every written intimation from the abovementioned officers must now expressly specify:

- i. The legal basis and statutory provision invoked,
- ii. The nature of the unlawful act, and
- iii. The specific URL, identifier, or other electronic location of the information, data, or communication link that is to be removed or disabled.

To ensure accountability in the exercise of such powers, all written intimations are now required to undergo a periodic review by an officer not below the rank of Secretary of the concerned Appropriate Government. Such reviews are now to be conducted once every month, ensuring that the intimations are necessary, proportionate, and consistent with the statutory provisions under Section 79(3)(b) of the IT Act and Rule 3(1)(d) of the IT Rules, 2021.

Notably, the IT Amendment Rules, 2025 omits the erstwhile *proviso* in Rule 3(1)(d) of the IT Rules, 2021, which clarified that an intermediary’s voluntary removal of information, whether pursuant to user grievances or its internal policies, would not constitute a violation of Section 79(2)(a) or Section 79(2)(b) of the IT Act. Thus, the erstwhile *proviso* expressly reserved the “safe harbour” protection granted to intermediaries from liability for third-party content hosted on their platforms in cases of voluntary removal. While the *proviso* has now been omitted, it does not necessarily imply that intermediaries are prohibited from undertaking voluntary takedowns, as the operative provisions of the IT Rules, 2021 continue to confer upon intermediaries both the authority and the responsibility to regulate content on their platforms in accordance with law and their stated policies.

6. The MeitY amends and notifies Designated Officers under Section 69A, following the IT Rules Amendment, 2025.

Section 69A of the IT Act empowers the Central Government to block access to online information when such action is necessary or expedient in the interest of national security, defence, sovereignty, integrity of India, public order, friendly relations with foreign states, or to prevent incitement to the commission of any cognizable offence. The Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguards for Blocking for Access



of Information by Public) Rules, 2009 (“**Blocking Rules, 2009**”) were issued under Section 69A of the IT Act to set out the procedure and safeguards for exercising this power.

Under the said Blocking Rules, 2009, it is mandatory that a request for blocking access to any online information must be received through the Nodal Officer of the respective state, or the government department specifically designated for the purpose of sending a request for blocking. The Nodal Officer, on being satisfied that the complaint warrants a blocking action, may forward the request for blocking to the Central Government in the Department of Information Technology under the MeitY. Under Rule 3 of the Blocking Rules, 2009, the Central Government has to designate by notification in the official gazette a “Designated Officer” not below the rank of a Joint Secretary for the purposes of issuing directions for blocking access under Section 69A of the IT Act. Thus, the direction for blocking under Section 69A of the IT Act can only be passed by the Designated Officer as provided under Rule 3 of the Blocking Rules, 2009, or through an appropriate court order.

On November 17, 2025, MeitY issued a notification designating senior officers under Section 69A of the IT Act, read with the Blocking Rules, 2009. Through this notification, MeitY appointed Shri Shri Akhil Kumar, as the Designated Officer empowered to issue directions concerning the blocking of public access to online information. Further, Shri Sushil Pal, has been designated to act in this capacity during the absence of Shri Ajit Kumar.

This notification aligns with the broader framework of the IT Amendment Rules, 2025, that enhances safeguards for content removal by intermediaries.

7. MeitY issues SOP on curbing circulation of non-consensual intimate imagery content.

MeitY released a Standard Operating Procedure (“**SOP**”) on November 11, 2025, to curb the online circulation of Non-Consensual Intimate Imagery (“**NCII**”) and to ensure swift redressal for victims. The SOP has been developed in compliance with the Hon’ble Madras High Court’s directions *vide* order dated July 15, 2025, in *X vs Union of India & Anr.*, wherein the Hon’ble Court directed MeitY to “*provide a prototype as to what a victim girl must do when faced with situations of dissemination of NCII content*”.⁴

Accordingly, the SOP provides a structured, victim-centric process for takedown and prevention of NCII content and also acts as a guide for intermediaries tasked with compliance under Rule 3(2)(b) of the IT Rules, 2021.

The SOP provides guidance on the following reporting channels through which a victim may submit grievances and request for the removal of NCII content:

- i. One Stop Centres (**OSCs**) falling under the aegis of the Ministry of Women and Child Development, which assist victims in filing complaints and navigating the reporting process;
- ii. In-app reporting mechanisms of the concerned intermediary, including raising a complaint with the Grievance Officer appointed under the IT Rules, 2021, or using platform-specific flagging tools;
- iii. registering a complaint on the National Cybercrime Reporting Portal;
- iv. lodging a complaint with local law enforcement agencies.

⁴ *X vs Union of India & Anr.*, W.P. No. 25017/2025.



Other key highlights of the SOP and compliance measures to be taken by intermediaries are as follows:

- i. All intermediaries shall align their community guidelines and the terms and conditions for users in line with the provisions of the IT Rules, 2021.
- ii. All intermediaries must remove or disable access to NCII content within 24 hours of receiving a complaint from an individual, an authorised representative, or an Appropriate Government or its agency under the IT Act.
- iii. Significant Social Media Intermediaries under the IT Act are required to use automated tools (such as hash-matching and crawlers) to prevent re-uploads of the same or similar NCII content.
- iv. Search engines must de-index flagged content.
- v. Content delivery networks (**CDNs**) and domain name registrars (**DNRs**) shall render the flagged content inaccessible, even across different URLs, within 24 hours of detection.
- vi. Intermediaries shall periodically inform the complainant about the removal of the flagged content as well as the resurfaced content.
- vii. MeitY oversees compliance and coordinates across departments such as the Indian Cybercrime Coordination Centre (I4C) under the Ministry of Home Affairs, which maintains the NCII hash ban and the Department of Telecommunications, Ministry of Communication, which facilitates URL blocking through Internet Service Providers (**ISPs**).

The SOP emphasises victim empowerment, privacy, and digital dignity. It aims to provide uniform and time-bound procedures for the removal of objectionable NCII content across online platforms.

8. The SEBI engages with digital platforms to reinforce investor protection framework

SEBI, on November 06, 2025, has intensified its efforts to safeguard investors against online financial scams by calling for enhanced cooperation from major social media platforms and search engine providers. In line with the global momentum driven by the International Organisation of Securities Commissions (“**IOSCO**”), SEBI has urged digital intermediaries to deploy stronger controls to prevent the dissemination of fraudulent investment content. The initiative follows IOSCO’s statement in May 2025, emphasising the critical responsibility of online platforms in mitigating risks of financial harm to retail investors.

As part of this coordinated push, SEBI has requested platforms to prioritise three immediate measures for implementation within the Indian securities market ecosystem:

- i. Mandatory verification of advertisers promoting investment products.
- ii. Clear labelling of trading applications operated by SEBI-registered intermediaries and
- iii. Stricter enforcement protocols for identifying and taking down deceptive investment promotions.

In parallel, SEBI has reiterated key precautions for investors to follow while engaging with financial intermediaries and investment apps online. Investors are advised to verify the registration details of any intermediary through the official SEBI website (www.sebi.gov.in) or the SEBI Intermediary Portal. Before making transactions, users should use only verified apps listed under SEBI-registered entities.



Transactions must be carried out exclusively through validated UPI handles bearing the “@valid” tag of SEBI-registered intermediaries and through the SEBI check facility available at <https://siportal.sebi.gov.in/intermediary/sebi-check> or *via* the Saarthi mobile application. These tools help investors confirm the authenticity of trading interfaces and prevent redirection to fraudulent payment links. These actions reaffirm SEBI’s commitment to a secure, transparent, and technology-aligned investor protection regime.

9. Judicial trend in the Personality Rights.

The rise of artificial intelligence technologies capable of producing deepfakes and other manipulated content has given rise to significant concerns around personality rights. These rights fundamentally serve to protect individuals, particularly well-known personalities, from unauthorized commercial exploitation and misuse of their name, image, voice, likeness, and other distinctive attributes, thereby preserving dignity and preventing deception in the digital landscape.

In recent years, there has been a notable increase in personality rights cases filed by leading Indian celebrities, including Anil Kapoor, Jackie Shroff, Hrithik Roshan, Aishwarya Rai Bachchan, Abhishek Bachchan, Karan Johar, Kumar Sanu, Akshay Kumar, and others, especially before the Hon’ble Delhi High Court and the Hon’ble Bombay High Court. While these claims address legitimate concerns of identity misuse and reputational harm, courts have also been cautious to ensure that such protections do not unduly restrict fan-created content, satire, or other transformative uses.

Most recently, on October 15, 2025, the Hon’ble Bombay High Court in *Akshay Hari Om Bhatia v. John Doe*⁵ has granted an *ex-parte* interim relief to the renowned actor Akshay Kumar, condemning the unauthorized use and commercial exploitation of his personality through the use of AI-generated deepfake videos and voice cloning. The plaintiff, Akshay Hari Om Bhatia, had filed a commercial suit seeking protection of personality rights under the Copyright Act, 1957, as well as his right to privacy and right to live with dignity under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, illustrating the growing intersection between intellectual property, privacy, and technological misuse.

The Hon’ble Bombay High Court held that Akshay Kumar possesses an inherent and enforceable right to control and protect his image and personal attributes, and that any unauthorized use constitutes a violation of both his personality and publicity rights, as well as his fundamental rights under the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the Court directed immediate takedown of all infringing content across platforms, including AI-generated material, and restrained the defendants from further misuse of his Screen Name “Akshay Kumar” and any abbreviation, moniker, or variation thereof, or his voice, image, likeness, distinctive performance, appearance, mannerisms, signature or any other uniquely identifiable attribute.

Similarly, on October 10, 2025, the Hon’ble Bombay High Court, in the case of *Suniel V Shetty v. John Doe S Ashok Kumar*⁶, granted interim protection to actor Suniel Shetty against the unauthorized use and misappropriation of his personality rights through AI-generated and deepfake content. The Court observed that the material placed on record, particularly the AI-generated images depicting the plaintiff and his family members, constituted a “*lethal combination of a depraved mind and the misuse of technology*,” causing harm to the plaintiff’s personality and moral rights.

⁵ *Akshay Hari Om Bhatia v. John Doe* 2025 SCC OnLine Bom 4044.

⁶ *Suniel V Shetty v. John Doe S Ashok Kumar* COMMERCIAL IP SUIT (L) NO. 32130 of 2025.



Accordingly, the Court issued an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction restraining the defendants from infringing or exploiting the plaintiff's name, image, likeness, voice, distinctive appearance, and other identifiable personality traits through AI-generated content, deepfakes, or similar means. It also directed the intermediaries to promptly remove and disable all identified infringing content and, upon further notice by the plaintiff, to take down any further infringing material and also disclose basic subscriber information of the uploaders.

These decisions add to the growing body of Indian jurisprudence recognising personality rights as an enforceable facet of the right to privacy as well as rights under the Copyright Act, 1957, particularly against emerging AI-driven misuses. It also highlights the increasing expectation that digital platforms and intermediaries act promptly to curb the dissemination of such infringing or deceptive content.

10. Kerala High Court mandates the use of AI for witness deposition.

The Hon'ble Kerala High Court, *via* an office memorandum dated October 21, 2025, has directed all district and session courts to adopt "Adalat.AI", a speech-to-text transcription tool, for the recording of witness depositions from November 01, 2025.

The introduction of Adalat.AI marks a transformative step in the Indian judiciary, aiming to make the recording of witness statements faster, more accurate, and transparent. Previously, the process relied on judges or typists manually writing or dictating every word spoken by a witness, which was not only time-consuming but also prone to errors and lengthy delays. With Adalat.AI, witness statements can now automatically be converted from speech to text in real time, significantly reducing the administrative burden and ensuring that depositions are recorded with high accuracy. The system supports multiple Indian languages, including legal terminology and regional phrases, making it accessible and reliable for courts across diverse linguistic regions.

Once the deposition has been duly recorded, it shall be uploaded to the District Court Case Management System (DCMS). Documents, including the Amin's report (kaicheet), bail bond, chemical analysis report, committal warrant, conviction warrant, court charge, death certificate, documents produced by a witness, the record of the examination of the accused, police kaicheet, release memo, etc., can also be uploaded. This process will ensure that depositions are readily accessible to parties and lawyers through their respective dashboards.

By mandating the use of Adalat.AI, Kerala has become the first state in India to make AI-based transcription of witness depositions compulsory, marking a significant leap towards digitisation and efficiency in court proceedings.



This newsletter is only for general informational purposes, and nothing in this edition of the newsletter could possibly constitute legal advice (which can only be given after being formally engaged and familiarizing ourselves with all the relevant facts). However, should you have any queries, require any assistance, or clarifications with regard to anything contained in this newsletter, please feel free to contact Sanjay Kumar / Abhishek Kumar Singh, at the below mentioned coordinates. © Luthra and Luthra Law Offices India 2025. All rights reserved.

KEY CONTACTS



SANJAY KUMAR

Senior Partner

Email - sjkumar@LUTHRA.COM



ABHISHEK KUMAR SINGH

Partner

Email - abhishekks@luthra.com

OFFICES



NEW DELHI

1st and 9th Floors, Ashoka Estate,
24 Barakhamba Road, New Delhi - 110 001
T: +91 11 4121 5100 F: +91 11 2372 3909
E: delhi@luthra.com



MUMBAI

20th Floor, Indiabulls Finance Center,
Tower 2 Unit A2, Elphinstone Road,
Senapati Bapat Marg, Mumbai - 400 013
T: +91 22 4354 7000
F: +91 22 6630 3700
E: mumbai@luthra.com



BENGALURU

3rd Floor, Onyx Centre, No. 5, Museum Road,
Bengaluru - 560 001
T: +91 80 4112 2800 / +91 80 4165 9245
F: +91 80 4112 2332
E: bengaluru@luthra.com



HYDERABAD

Serene Towers,
House No. 8-2-623/A,
Road No. 10, Banjara Hills,
Hyderabad, Telangana - 500034
T: +91 40 7969 6162
E: hyderabad@luthra.com



CHENNAI

Prestige Palladium Bayan,
8th Floor, Greams Road, Nungambakkam Division,
Egmore, Chennai - 600 006,
Tamil Nadu