

MHCC010082932025



IN THE BOMBAY CITY CIVIL COURT AT BOMBAY.

NOTICE OF MOTION NO.3298 OF 2025

IN

S. C. SUIT NO.3240 OF 2024

Mr. Vashu Bhagnani

... PLAINTIFF

**Versus**

Mr. Kamal Rashid Khan

... DEFENDANT

**APPEARANCES :**

Ms. Megha Chandra IB M/s. Naik Naik & Co., Advocate for Plaintiff.

Ms. Neha Pandey H/F Mr. Ashok Saraogi, Advocate for Defendant.

**CORAM :** AMIT ANANT LAULKAR,  
JUDGE  
COURT ROOM NO.02

**DATED :** 05<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2025

**ORDER**

1. Being disgruntled with defendant for posing defamatory and scandalous contents, the plaintiff herein preferred present suit wherein instant notice of motion is moved seeking interim reliefs in the form of injunction against the defendant vide Order 39 Rule 1 of the Code Of Civil Procedure, 1908.

(2)

2. *Per* plaintiff, he is a renowned and a prominent film producer. The Defendant is an actor and reality TV personality. The offended tweets posted by the defendant in his Twitter account wherein he has made grossly defamatory, slanderous, distasteful and patently false allegations against the plaintiff. The defamatory content in the said offended tweets are factually incorrect, slanderous, false and has lowered and damaged the plaintiff's impeccable reputation and has exposed him to un-called for embarrassment, humiliation and ridicule.

3. According to plaintiff, he has been a part of the Indian Film Industry since 1995. During this period, he has been involved in several cinematographic films, which were both critically acclaimed and also hugely successful at the box office. In his long association with making of cinematograph films, the plaintiff has worked with the best actors and artists of the Indian Film Industry, has close association and intimate working relationship with likes of Mr. Amitabh Bacchan, Ms. Aishwarya Rai Bacchan, Mr. Govinda, Mr. John Abraham, Mr. David Dhawan, Mr. Akshay Kumar and Mr. Saif Ali Khan etc. Plaintiff is known for his larger than life blockbuster movies, which cater to an extremely wide-ranging and a large audience. The plaintiff's films are generally "big budget" movies which generate extensive curiosity and excitement for cine-goers. The fact the plaintiff is associated with a particular film or that he promotes it is in itself a big draw for the public. Having said that, as veteran of the Indian Film Industry, he has also earned the reputation for promoting and encouraging new talent. Every member professionally and personally known to him has always held him in the highest regard. Plaintiff has also attempted to take relevant issues and address them through his work. As a responsible citizen, over the years,

the plaintiff has also been associated with several social causes and has attempted to make a contribution to society not only through his work, but also by associating with prominent NGOs, which have been working in respect of a variety of social issues. These are only representative examples, and the plaintiff has taken up diverse causes from time to time, particularly in the interest of the Indian Film Industry. On the whole therefore, the plaintiff is not only known for his craft, and work but also held in high regard and esteem by his peers, as also by the public at large.

4. Plaintiff further urged that on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2021, plaintiff was pained and perturbed when he came to realize that the defendant had initiated a well-orchestrated smear campaign against the plaintiff without any due cause whatsoever. The defendant is even otherwise known to make defamatory and slanderous comments against "soft targets" of the Indian Film Industry in an extremely cheap attempt to gain mileage and publicity. The defendant's conduct was evident from a series of "tweets" on the social network "Twitter" that made grossly defamatory, slanderous, distasteful and patently false allegations against the plaintiff.

**5. The contents of the said tweets are extracted hereunder:**

**3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2021.**

If you don't think that I wont make project making video of film #bellbottom then you are 100% wrong. There is too much of gadbad Ghotala in the making. So I am getting everything right to make it.

(4)

Vashu Indian, Vashu Dubai, Vashu London 3 producers and one Aatma are involved in this

**25<sup>th</sup> March, 2021.**

"Finally, I will release project making report of #bellbottom! After watching this report World will be able to understand the "Gorakh Dhandha" of producer Vashu Bhagnani and Akki Baba! How funds get transferred from india to Dubai to London to Canada to USA etc."

**19<sup>th</sup> February, 2021**

"Yesterday #KRKBO revealed that Producer Vashu bhagnani has not paid full amount for remake rights of his film #BELLBOTTOM and he is facing a legal case in Bangalore court. And Today he announced RELEASE DATE 28 May 2021, to prove that there is no problem at all"

**19<sup>th</sup> February, 2021**

Vashu Bhagnani ji will be able to release #bellbottom on 28 May 2021 if the following two things happen

- 1) He will pay balance amount
- 2) Theaters will not be closed permanently till that date All the best to him "

**9<sup>th</sup> March, 2019**

"today no actor is ready to do producer Vashu Bhagani film and it's one more proof, Ki Bollywood Kisi KI Jagir Nahin. Yahan sirf Chadhte Sooraj Ko HI Salam Kiya Jata Hain

**25<sup>th</sup> March, 2021**

Producer #VashuBhagnani is responsible to destroy the Bollywood, who has given Rs. 125 cr.to Akki per film, Rs 50C to Tiger for 2 films and Rs. 50 cr to Ayushman for 2 films. And he doesn't care if he will have loss of Rs. 200CH How? Why?

**20<sup>th</sup> February, 2021**

According to our sources #Akshaykumar watched #BellBottom and didn't like it at all. So he doesn't want to say anything about it anymore Akshay refused to promote film #Joker also after watching it Because he knew that the film will become a big disaster.

**19<sup>th</sup> February, 2021**

Akshay Kumar didn't tweet and confirm release date of film #bell bottom till now Means there can be 2 reasons

- 1) Vashu Bhagnani has not paid his full amount
- 2) Vashu ji didn't consult with him before to announce release date.

**20<sup>th</sup> March, 2021**

No buyer available for Akshay kumar films. His films like #Sooryavanshi & #bellbottom are not getting released. But he is launching one new film every month n shooting 24\*7! Because he knows that he is having 2-3Yrs only to make money. Crazy producers are paying him Approx 125Cr!

(6)

**9<sup>th</sup> December, 2020**

People were expecting to watch some good films on #OTT instead it has become a dumping place of crap films. A single good film has not released on any #OTT platform in 2020. But few more crap films like #Coolie No.1 are going to release soon.

**22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2020**

Top Nepo Kids Varun Dhawan and #SaraAlIKhan film #Coollele I is going to release on Friday! Will you watch it?

**24<sup>th</sup> June, 2019**

Jacky Bhagnani Bhale Hi Vashu Ji Ke Bête Hon. But Inhone Zindagi Main Har Kaam Bahut Bada Kiya Hai! Ab Ye Dekho, Berozgar Directors Ko Rozgar Diya Hai!

**9:00 AM, 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2020**

KRK @ kamaalrkhan

Varun is almost forcing producer #VashuBhagnani to not release his film #coolie No.1 on digital because he wants to prove that he is a big star. Lol Vashu ji is Sindhi so he will never accept the loss. Therefore I can say with 100% guarantee that it will release on OTT for sure.

**02<sup>nd</sup> December, 2020**

Survey result- Only 39% Besharam and Faaltu ppl want to watch film #Coolie No.1 means it's super flop before the release only. (hereinafter the above content will be referred to as "offending tweets")

**6. The essence of the said tweets was that:**

- i. The plaintiff is guilty of not making payments in respect of the remake rights of his film "Bellbottom"
- ii. The film would be released "only" if the plaintiff paid such outstanding dues;
- iii. The plaintiff and Mr. Akshay Kumar are clandestinely engaged in illegal/hawala transactions where money is routed from India to Dubai to London to Canada to USA etc.
- iv. The plaintiff is responsible to "destroy Bollywood" by paying grossly huge amounts to actors without worrying about the losses that his films will suffer, which would be in excess of 200 crores.
- v. The plaintiff's son cannot act, and his films will not work.

7. It is urged that when the plaintiff made further enquiries about the agenda of the defendant against the plaintiff; the plaintiff's team also found that the defendant has made a scandalous, grossly defamatory, derogatory 10-minute video titled "**Corrupt Bollywood**". In the said video, he has referenced various prominent personalities such as Karan Johar, Farah Khan, Ekta Kapoor, David Dhawan, Shah Rukh Khan, Salman Khan and has spoken ill of them. The video is laced with statements that are per se defamatory. In the said Video, the defendant has also attributed such comments to the plaintiff and has also flashed a photo of the plaintiff at 3.52 minutes and 7.24 minutes of the videos. Thus, the insinuation of the defendant against the plaintiff being corrupt is absolutely clear. For representative purposes, certain statements from the said video that as per se defamatory are set out hereunder:

(8)

*"Ab aap dekhthe jao ek ek kar ke sabko kaise nanga karta hoon. Aaj aap ko main dikhaonga kaise yeh Bollywood makkar aur jhoote logon se kaise bhara pada hain.."*

*"main 20,000 sq.ft ghar main rahta hoon. Aap ke jaisa kachra patti main nahin rehta..aap ki aukat mere saamne toh kuch bhi nahin hain."*

*"lekin yeh itne besharam hain, itne ghatiya hain ke phir yeh kehte hain ki KRK ne yeh kiya, KRK ne who kiya..."*

*pehle to tum lukho yeh decide karloke main self proclaimed critic hoon Aski koi value nahin hain "*

*"main hamesha ki tarah inki filmon ka sachha review deta rahoonga, inko nachata rahoonga aur inse mujhrah karata rahoonga...."*

8. The plaintiff further submits that when the plaintiff made further enquiries about the agenda of the defendant against the plaintiff and his team also found that the defendant has made a scandalous, grossly defamatory, derogatory 14 minute video titled "Film Coolie No.1 Review By KRK" dated 25 December, 2020. In the said video he has made the following defamatory statements:

*"Mr. Jackie Bhagnani i.e. my son as yeh genius nahin yeh, yeh akal se paidal hain. Na Inko filmon ke baren main pata hain nahi inko public ke baare main kuch pata hain."*

*"Mr. Vashu Bhagnani has more attitude in meeting with Mr. David Dhawan and hence they both met in J.W. Marriot. "*



*Jackie Bhagnani thinks himself as Hoshiyarchand and there is no one clever than him. The reason the dialogues were written from Farhad Shamji is because Jackie Bhagnani "ek pagal insaan hain aur iski help karni hain.*

9. The contents of aforesaid tweets and videos is out rightly false and *per se* defamatory. While there is a proceeding pending with the Court at Bangalore, it is the plaintiff's case that the subject matter of that proceeding is not the plaintiff's film Bell Bottom that is scheduled to release. The comments of the defendant are read by the public at large, and are intended to pronounce the plaintiff as guilty of an act which he has not committed. Similarly, the baseless conspiracy theory of the plaintiff in engaging in "*hawala*" transaction with Mr. Akshay Kumar or of being "corrupt" is grossly scandalous, false, and *per se* defamatory. It seems to be the *modus operandi* of the defendant to target "big banner films" at the time of their release with an aim to get easy and cheap publicity at the expense of others. Any person from the public is bound to have a not so favorable opinion of the plaintiff on account of the comments/tweets of the defendant.

10. Each of the allegations made against plaintiff in the offending tweets and the videos are totally baseless. The contents of the same are calculated to cause loss and damage the reputation of the plaintiff. The offending tweets as a whole is grossly slanderous. Plaintiff and his family have been subject to embarrassment, humiliation and ridicule amongst members of the public and especially amongst the general public, who may have believed the contents of the offending

(10)

tweets to be true. Clearly, this is a smear campaign by the defendant against the plaintiff. The said offending tweets and the video have already received wide publicity. Lacs of people have read them, thousands have commented on them, at the expense of the plaintiff. The said offending tweets has been "tagged", "referenced" and commented upon on social media by many people on twitter. "Trolls", as they are known, have circulated/forwarded and commented upon the said tweet without knowing anything about the matter and the truth. Individuals with "verified" accounts on twitter have proceeded to hold the plaintiff guilty in respect of the allegations made against him by the defendant. This has led to serious prejudice, social media trial and has created a false perception in the minds of the general public. Even with respect to these posts, the "hashtags" and "tag lines" and "captions" that are used are suggestive, biased and one-sided. The plaintiff is literally condemned unheard. This has clearly affected the reputation-built brick by brick, over the years, by the plaintiff. All this is on account of the motivated and reckless offending tweet circulated by the defendant. In consequence, plaintiff has already been seriously defamed and has suffered considerable damage to the plaintiff's reputation and goodwill. The offending tweets and the videos have already caused damage to the plaintiff reputation and goodwill, and have further exposed them to public hatred, ridicule and contempt. The effect of the offending tweets is to tarnish and besmirch the reputation and standing of the plaintiff as film producers. This has been done without any cause whatsoever.

11. It is further urged that, this is not the first time the defendant has been called out for his defamatory and scandalous comments and had also been found guilty as such by this Court. The

Defendant is known to make outrageous and scandalous remarks about prominent "sift targets" to gain unfair mileage. In fact, this Court has passed restraint orders against the Defendant from making Defamatory comments against Mr. Nikhil Dwivedi (director) & Ms. Richa Chadha (actor). Thus, the defendant is not only incorrigible in this regard, but is also brazen about his *modus operandi* and has the slightest regard for the law or for this Court and its orders.

12. The mental suffering caused to the plaintiff cannot even be calculated in terms of money. The words published in the said offending tweets and the video were made to cause and to bring the plaintiff into hatred, contempt or ridicule and to diminish the good opinion that people at large have of him and, therefore, the defendant is liable to be punished for the offence of defamation. Even the duty cast on defendant in law or for public interest obligated the said defendant to ensure that any words or news published, spoken or telecast do not in any manner cast any doubt on plaintiff's self-esteem. The derogatory implication of the statement made would cause mental injury and would bring the plaintiff in disrepute in the eyes of people at large. The comments of the defendant are a deliberate attempt to malign the plaintiff and with oblique motive of bringing down the goodwill, estimation and reputation which the plaintiff maintains among the Public and his followers. The defendant knew very well that the imputations in the aforesaid statement are false and baseless. But the said statements were prepared, selected, edited and posted on Twitter was for public viewership, by the defendant in furtherance of his intention to tarnish the image and lower the reputation of the plaintiff.

(12)

All the defamatory statements made by the defendant was with the culpable intention to malign the image of the plaintiff and fully knowing that those are baseless and untrue and with a heinous intention to malign and lower the reputation of the plaintiff among the General Public. Publishing and tweeting highly scandalous, false and defamatory imputations against the plaintiff; the defendant has tarnished and harmed the reputation of the plaintiff. It has affected his reputation, goodwill and public image. The statements have created an impression among the general public that the plaintiff is a shameful and a vile person and these untrue imputations has caused great harm to the reputation of the plaintiff. Pursuant to the tweeting of the statements, many well-wishers of the plaintiff have contacted the plaintiff and inquired about the allegations and expressed their concern that the defamatory statement has been causing a dent in the good repute and clean image, which the plaintiff holds in the minds of public. The acts of the defendant clearly amount to blatant scandal mongering and are per se defamatory as they seek to denigrate the plaintiff and harm his impeccable reputation amongst the general public. Defendant knowingly and intentionally made the offending tweets and Video; Defendant was well aware that such scandalous and slanderous statements will harm the reputation and goodwill of the plaintiff. Finally, the plaintiff knocked the doors of this court with instant suit and implored that The allegations contained in the offending tweets against the plaintiff is *ex facie* false, untrue and baseless and per se defamatory; and therefore, it is just, fair and equitable and in the interest of justice and equity that pending the hearing and final disposal of the present suit, the interim reliefs be granted and oblige.

13. Post receipt of writ of summons, defendant caused his appearance and tendered his affidavit in reply posing equipotent objections for allowing the motion. As per defendant, the motion is false, frivolous and misconceived. It is based upon distorted facts and absolutely untenable within four walls of law. The plaintiff has exaggerated his version. It is strongly denied that the alleged tweets are false, misleading and baseless. It is further urged that the defendant has nowhere made a scandalous, grossly defamatory, derogatory video and have spoken ill of the personalities listed by the plaintiff in the pleadings. The defendant has not said anything personal about the plaintiff. He only reviewed the films of the plaintiff and have made comments thereon. As per defendant, he is critic and it is his job to review films and talk about the trade. He is free to say anything about the film as a critic and review its status. The plaintiff made films for public view and reviewing said film is not an offence. It is denied that the plaintiff has suffered mental agony. The defendant justified his conduct by way of freedom of speech. He out rightly denied whole claim cum version of the plaintiff in *toto*. On all above counts, the defendant craves for rejection of the motion in *limine*.

14. Heard learned Advocate Ms. Megha Chandra, for the plaintiff. Despite opportunity, none appeared for the defendant for submissions.

15. I have pondered over entire record specially the alleged tweets, video extracts and statements made by the defendant minutely.

16. The main object of the interlocutory injunction is to protect the plaintiff against injury by violation of his right for which he could not be adequately compensated in damages recoverable in the actions if the uncertainty is resolved in his favour at the trial. It is well settled that for grant of temporary injunction three vital factors have to be satisfied which are prima-facie case, balance of convenience and irreparable loss. A useful reference on the point can be taken from the verdict delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Dalpat Kumar V/s. Pralhad Singh, AIR 1993 (SC) 276* wherein aforesaid three vital factors lightened as follows -

- i) There is a serious disputed question to be tried in the Court and that an act, on the facts before the Court, there is probability of his being entitled to the relief asked for by the plaintiff/defendant.
- ii) The Court's interference is necessary to protect the party from the species of injury. In other words, irreparable injury or danger would ensue before the legal right would be established at the trial **and**
- iii) That the comparative hardship on mischief or inconvenience which is likely to occur from withholding the injunction will be greater than that would be likely to acted from granting it.

Naturally plaintiff's claim deserves to be scanned from the legal cannons elucidated above.

17. By way of instant motion, the plaintiff is claiming an injunction against the defendant from publishing, circulating or repeating allegations about the plaintiff which are posed as a defamatory and scandalous. The plaintiff further implored for

conferring interim mandatory injunction against the defendant thereby directing him to publish a written unconditional apology on his tweeter account and also in the newspaper, Times of India or any other paper desirable followed by deleting the whole objectionable content from the social media.

18. In the backdrop of submissions, I have scanned entire record minutely. The defendant has loudly admitted tweets as well as videos which are subject matter of instant suit. However, he has denied any wrongful intention or guilty mind / motive to defame the plaintiff in any manner. Indeed, the defendant is coming up with the case that he is a critic and as a matter of personal fundamental right to speech he just reviewed the films of the plaintiff and expressed candid opinion about it. He never made any statement which is derogatory, outrageous and scandalous of the plaintiff. In the light of said scenario, at this *prima facie* stage, the only point remains for consideration whether the defendant has exceeded his limits as a critic or not and whether the statements, tweets and videos posed by him were subject to the defamation of the plaintiff or not. This Court is mindful of the fact that to prove their version the plaintiff is required to adduce detail evidence and it is only after evaluating and analyzing entire evidence, the main reliefs would be decided at the time of final adjudication only. Therefore, at the moment, only *prima facie* evaluation of those tweets and statements is required and epochal for having due deliberation over instant motion.

19. Having scrutinizing all tweets, statements and videos as detailed in the plaint and its annexures, *prima facie*, it reveals that somehow, the defendant appears to have exceeded his limits as a critic and encroached upon the privacy as well as public image of the plaintiff. All tweets and statements posed by the defendant are his personal opinion which cannot be accepted under the guise of the review. The defendant has not revealed any strong base for airing such review. The defendant tried to portray the picture that they are only criticism-based comments and nothing else but, to my wits, it appears that they are something more than criticism and at this stage, some sort of regulation upon the defendant from publishing, circulating or repeating such allegations are significant. If such directions are not passed then such series of tweets and statements would persist thereby posing no end to the litigation.

20. While highlighting in the suit for damages on the strength of defamation, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Jagadishkumar Thakkar Vs. Waahid Ali Khan, (2024 SCC Online Bom 1079)*** emphasized particularly in para No.15 and 19 in following manner.

“ 15. In words of Cave, J in *Scot vs. Samson, 1882 (8) QBD*, “The Law recognizes in every man a right to have the estimation in which he stands, in the opinion of others, unaffected by false statement to his discredit.” Every man possesses an inherent personal right to have his reputation reserved inviolate. Any imputation which may tend to lower the image of a person, in the estimation of right thinking members of society generally or to expose him to hatred, contempt or ridicule is defamatory to him. The publication of words defamatory of the Plaintiff, give rise to *prima facie* cause of action and the law presume in favour of such a party, that the



*words are false unless the Defendant proves to the contrary.*

*19. Under the Law of Defamation, the test of defamatory nature of a statement is its tendency to insight an adverse opinion on feeling of other persons towards the Plaintiff. The words must result in the Plaintiff to be looked upon with the feeling of hatred, contempt, ridicule, dislike or to convey an imputation to him or disparaging him or his office, profession, calling, trade or business. In India, like most other common law countries the burden is proof is on the Defendant to show that the statement is true or the publication was not intentional. In **S. Puttaswamy vs. Union of India**, a 9 Judge Bench of the Highest Court has authoritatively held that right of privacy is a fundamental right and the only permitted exception is where, there is counter veiling public interest, which in particular circumstances is strong enough to outweigh it.”*

21. An interim order in a defamation lawsuit is a temporary court order that can be issued to stop the alleged defamatory content from being published or circulated while the case is ongoing. To grant such an order, a court must typically find a "*prima facie*" case, meaning there is enough evidence to suggest a wrong has occurred, and that the plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm if the order isn't issued. Courts must balance the plaintiff's right to reputation with the defendant's right to freedom of speech, often applying a strict standard like the Bonnard standard.

22. This is a key principle in defamation cases, requiring courts to be extremely cautious in granting pre-trial injunctions to protect free

(18)

speech. The standard suggests an injunction should only be granted if the court is certain the statement is false and the defendant cannot justify it at trial.

23. Courts must balance the fundamental right to reputation with the right to freedom of speech and expression.

24. These aspects need a delicate and balanced approach to ensure that right against reputational damage, right to privacy and right to freedom of speech and expression can go hand in hand and not at the cost of each other.

25. Applying aforesaid legal cum factual scenario to present set of facts, it is crystalline that *prima facie* tweets and statements made by the defendant are somehow affecting the right of privacy of the plaintiff. The goodwill and reputation of the plaintiff is at stake and the defendant has no absolute right to damage the same by expressing his personal opinions at public domain under the guise of Review. Certainly, there is every reason to regulate such act till the final adjudication of the suit. Right to speech of one person should not cause breach of right of privacy and public image of other person. There are certain self-restrictions and the defendant ought to have followed it impeccably.

26. Summing up, I believe, the plaintiff has shown *prima facie* substance in his version. The alleged tweets, videos and other statements if not curbed and regulated so also not prevented from circulating and publishing in the public domain, it will cause grave loss, mental agony to the plaintiff. On other hand, if interim reliefs are not

granted, no prejudice would cause to the defendant. It is not the contingency that by way of interim injunction, his rights of free speech & expression are precluded by the orders of this Court. Only the way of expression and its regulation is expected and, on that count, the balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiff.

27. At the moment, to suffice justice, all subject tweets and videos deserve deletion from the media, at the instance of the defendant.

28. Before saying omega, it is pertinent to note that the plaintiff has sought interim mandatory injunction against the defendant seeking direction for tendering a written unconditional apology. I perceive, at the moment, without having evidence in detail, such mandate cannot be issued against the defendant. There are no exceptional circumstances shown by the plaintiff to confer interim mandatory injunction against the defendant. The aspect of tendering unconditional apology would be tested on the touchstone of evidence at the time of final adjudication of the suit. Besides that allowing such interim mandate would be noting but grant of final prayers and it is not sustainable at this stage. Hence, on that count, the plaintiff is not entitled for said relief.

29. Culmination of facts and circumstances manifested above speaks into volume that the plaintiff has shown *prima facie* substance in his version thereby entailing the reliefs of temporary injunction. If such injunction is not granted it will pave way for multiplicity of litigation.

(20)

Certainly, the motion deserves partial approval. At the end, I answer all aspects in favour of the plaintiff.

**30.           *Ergo the order.***

**ORDER**

1.    Present Notice of Motion **No.3298 of 2025** is made absolute in terms of prayer clause 'a' and 'c'.
2.    Pending the hearing and final disposal of the suit, by way of order of injunction, the defendant, his agent, servant and any person claiming through or under him are temporarily restrained from publishing, circulating or repeating the allegations, tweets and videos mentioned in para 14 and 15 in Exhibit A, Exhibit B, Exhibit C, para 17 in Exhibit D annexed to the Plaint and/or making, publishing, circulating and/or communicating to the public any defamatory/slandorous comments and/or statements against the plaintiff and/or his family and/or his business, profession and/or his projects.
3.    Pending the hearing and final disposal of the suit, by way of order of injunction, the defendant is hereby directed to delete or withdraw the offending allegations mentioned in prayer clause “a” of the motion.
4.    Prayer clause ‘b’ is hereby rejected.
5.    Notice of Motion is disposed of accordingly.

Date : 05.12.2025

(Amit Anant Laulkar)  
Judge,  
City Civil Court, Mumbai.

“CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED ORDER.”		
08.12.2025	5.25 p.m.	Shilpa P Pawar Stenographer - Grade I
UPLOAD DATE	TIME	

Name of the Judge (With Court Room No.)	H. H. Judge Shri. Amit A. Laulkar Court Room No.2.
Date of Pronouncement of ORDER	05.12.2025
ORDER signed by P. O. on	08.12.2025
ORDER uploaded on	08.12.2025