

MMWL/SEC/25-26

February 11, 2026

**To**

**BSE Limited,**

1st Floor, New Trading Wing  
Rotunda Building, Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers  
Dalal Street, Fort, Mumbai – 400 001  
[corp.relations@bseindia.com](mailto:corp.relations@bseindia.com)

**Security Code No: 512267**

**RE: Regulation 30 and 47 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015**

**Subject: Publication of Un-audited Financial Results for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter and Nine Months ended December 31, 2025, of the Financial Year 2025-26, in Newspapers.**

---

**Dear Sir(s)/ Madam,**

This is further to our earlier announcement dated February 10, 2026.

We hereby submit the copies of the newspaper publications of the **Un-audited Financial Results of the Company for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter and Nine Months ended December 31, 2025, of the Financial Year 2025-26**, on both Standalone and Consolidated basis, as published on **February 11, 2026**, in the following newspapers, as per the requirements of Regulation 47 of the Securities and Exchange Board of India (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015.

1. Hindustan Times – English (copy for Mumbai Edition are attached)
2. Pudhari (Mumbai Edition) – Marathi (copy attached)

It may be noted that the aforesaid Un-audited Financial Results, had been considered and approved by the Board of Directors of the Company, at its meeting held on February 10, 2026, and were submitted to the Stock Exchange (BSE Limited) on the same day.

You are requested to take the above information on records.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

**For Media Matrix Worldwide Limited**

**(Mohd Sagir)**

Company Secretary

**Encl.: As above**

---

**Registered Office:** A/308, Dynasty Business Park CHS LTD, A K Road, Opp. Sangam Cinema, Near Kohinoor Hotel, Andheri (East), Mumbai – 400059; Telephone: +91-22-46089205, Fax: +91-91-22-46089205

---

**Corp Office:** Plot No 38, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Sector 32, Gurgaon 122001.  
Telephone: +91-124-4310000, Fax: +91-124-4310050 Email: [mmwl.corporate@gmail.com](mailto:mmwl.corporate@gmail.com)  
Website: [www.mmwlindia.com](http://www.mmwlindia.com), Corporate Identity Number: L32100MH1985PLC036518

# 3-hour deadline for social media firms to remove harmful content

Sejal Sharma

letters@hindustantimes.com

**NEW DELHI:** Social media companies will have to remove or disable access to certain unlawful or harmful content within three hours of receiving a valid government direction, a formal grievance, or becoming aware of a clear violation under amendments to the Information and Technology Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code Rules, 2021, notified on Tuesday.

The new deadline – a sharp reduction from the previous 36-hour window under Rule 30(1) – was not part of draft amendments proposed by the ministry of electronics and information technology (MeitY) in October 2025 and has been introduced only in the final notification. The amendments take effect on February 20, 2026.

The tight timeline, requiring near-immediate action from platforms such as Instagram, Facebook and YouTube, is expected to face pushback from industry.

The draft had mandated visible

Legal experts warned the shift leaves little room for careful review, especially in cases involving subjective violations such as hate speech, fake news claims, and could force platforms to remove reported content first and assess it later, increasing the risk of over-takedown.

Google did not respond to HT's queries by the time of publication, while other platforms said it is reviewing the amendments internally. Y-t did not respond.

A senior MeitY official, requesting anonymity, defended the compressed deadline. "Experience has shown us that intermediaries capable of technical intervention fairly quickly do not have cases when they have been able to act within minutes. So clearly they have the technical capacity and notice, indicating that the content is synthetically generated."

The government has also reworked how platforms identify synthetic content, dropping rigid technical requirements proposed in October's draft.

The draft had mandated visible

**NEW RULES ALSO MAKE IDENTIFIERS FOR AI CONTENT MUST, BUT DROP MINIMUM SIZE CONDITION**

watermarking covering at least 10% of a screen or audio tags during the first 10% of a clip – a fixed-size requirement that has now been removed.

Instead of prescribing exact dimensions, the final rules require platforms to use "reasonable proportionate technical measures" to identify AI content, cropping, formating, noise reduction and basic processing are now carried out and will not be treated as AI-generated media – a concern flagged by the Internet and Mobile Association of India. Other platforms include Google, Meta, Snapchat and WhatsApp, in its October submissions to MeitY.

Dhruv Gary, partner at policy and business advisory Indian Governance & Policy Project, said: "The narrowing of the definition of synthetic content to exclude noise or good faith editing, enhancement, accuracy improvements, and document preparation signifi-

cantly reduces the risk of overreach and unintended impact on ordinary digital activity, creative expression, and assistive technology."

Asked whether platforms currently have the technical ability to reliably detect AI-generated content, all the companies quoted above said companies already deploy sophisticated systems to detect AI-generated content and have the resources to build similar capabilities for synthetic media.

MeitY, separately, remains locked in a dispute with social media platform X, owned by Elon Musk. Musk claims that its AI and its Greek general, the AI that has been accused of being sexist and传播ing explicit and abusive images targeting women users. Governments in Europe and Asia have criticised the tool's safeguards and opened inquiries, while X has partially restricted the feature to paid users and has a ban on political content.

Dhruv Gary, partner at policy and business advisory Indian Governance & Policy Project, said: "The narrowing of the definition of synthetic content to exclude noise or good faith editing, enhancement, accuracy improvements, and document preparation signifi-

antly reduces the risk of overreach and unintended impact on ordinary digital activity, creative expression, and assistive technology."

Asked whether platforms currently have the technical ability to reliably detect AI-generated content, all the companies quoted above said companies already deploy sophisticated systems to detect AI-generated content and have the resources to build similar capabilities for synthetic media.

MeitY, separately, remains locked in a dispute with social media platform X, owned by Elon Musk. Musk claims that its AI and its Greek general, the AI that has been accused of being sexist and传播ing explicit and abusive images targeting women users. Governments in Europe and Asia have criticised the tool's safeguards and opened inquiries, while X has partially restricted the feature to paid users and has a ban on political content.

Dhruv Gary, partner at policy and business advisory Indian Governance & Policy Project, said: "The narrowing of the definition of synthetic content to exclude noise or good faith editing, enhancement, accuracy improvements, and document preparation signifi-

# New India-UK pact eases social security payments

Foreign secy, Chinese counterpart review process to rebuild ties

Rezaul H Laskar

letters@hindustantimes.com

**NEW DELHI:** India and the UK on Tuesday signed an agreement aimed at eliminating double taxation on social security payments made by employees in short-term assignments in both countries, thereby facilitating the cross-border movement of professionals.

The Agreement on Social Security Payments, signed by Foreign Secretary S. Jaishankar and his Chinese counterpart, Ma Zhaoxu, held a strategic dialogue on Tuesday to review the process of stabilising and rebuilding bilateral ties, including increasing air connectivity and visa facilitation, and to discuss concerns on sensitive issues.

Ma, the executive vice foreign minister in China's foreign ministry, was in New Delhi to participate in the Brics Sherpa Meeting during February 9-10. His meeting with Jaishankar was part of the engagement with the Indian delegation to the annual Brics summit, which they reached an understanding in October 2024 on ending the military face-off in the Ladakh sector of the Line of Actual Control (LAC). Misri and Ma discussed a range of bilateral, regional and international issues, and their discussions focused on the progress in stabilising and rebuilding bilateral ties and ways to take bilateral engagement forward, the external affairs ministry said in a readout.

The agreement is part of India's broader strategy to work with the UK to come into effect together with the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, planned for implementation in the first half of 2026.

The pact is expected to boost India's services exports in finance and technology, by exempting employers of Indian workers from paying social security contributions in the UK for three years. The government has earlier said the agreement is expected to benefit around 75,000 workers and more than 900 companies, with a total value of 1.5 billion to 2 billion euros of more than \$4,000 crore.

Despite social security contributions by professionals and employees in their home country and the nations where they are temporarily deployed, have been a major concern for India, for Indian businesses and skilled workers. India has concluded similar bilateral social security agreements with other countries to protect the interests of Indian professionals and skilled workers working abroad for short durations.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

at silencing him for his public activism and role in exposing the Vyapam scam.

Appearing for Rai, senior advocates Kapil Sibal and Vivek Tankha had previously argued that none of the essential ingredients required to attract offences under the SC/ST Act were present in the case.

It was understood that there was no caste-specific reference, intentional insult or intimidation directed at a member of the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes, as mandated by law.

The government said that when it halted the trial pending final adjudication of RAI's challenge and expressed concern over the manner in which the SC/ST Act had been invoked.

Rai has consistently main-

tained that the case was a product of "malicious prosecution" aimed

