

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY**

**CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO: 1346 OF 2026**

Petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India aggrieved by the Order dated 28.04.2026 Passed in I.A.No. 576 of 2026 in OS No. 176 of 2026 on the file of the XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court at Hyderabad.

**Between:**

Ms. Venkata Aswini Reddy Koyya @ Ashu Reddy, D/o V. Krishna Koyya, Aged about 33 years, Occupation. Actress, Television Host and Content Creator, R/o 8-65 Main Road Aganampudi, R/o Visakhapatnam, presently residing at Hyderabad.

**...Petitioners**

**AND**

1. Mr. Yenumula Satyanarayana Murthy, S/o Mr. Yenumula Dharmarao, Aged about 60 years, Occupation. Not Known to the Plaintiff, R/o Flat No. A-1703, Aparna One, Shaikpet, Hyderabad -500104, Telangana.
2. M/s. NTV Telugu. a Telugu news television channel and digital news platform, having its office at 564-A-19/III, Road No. 92, MLA Colony, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500096, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
3. M/s. Mahaa News, a Telugu news television, channel and digital news platform, having its office at Plot No. 202, Road No. 76, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500096. Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
4. M/s. Indira Television Limited, (operating the Telugu news television channel Sakshi TV), having its registered office at 6-3-249/1, Sakshi Towers. Road No. 1, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad -500034, Telangana, represented by its Authorised Representative, Email. companysecretary@sakshi.com.
5. M/s. ABN Andhra Jyothy Pvt. Ltd., (operating the Telugu news television channel ABN Telugu and the Telugu daily newspaper Andhra Jyothy and its digital edition andhrajyothy.com), having its office at Road No. 86, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500096, Telangana, represented by its Chief Editor / Director.
6. M/s. HMTV Telugu, a Telugu news television channel and digital news platform, having its office at Plot No. 1042, Road No. 52, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500033, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.

7. M/s. Associated Broadcasting Company Pvt. Ltd., (operating the Telugu news television channel TV9 Telugu and the Telugu entertainment news brand and digital channel TV9 Entertainment), having its principal office at Sagar Society, Road No. 2, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad -500034, Telangana, with TV9 Entertainment additionally operating from Plot No. 97, Road No. 3, SBI Executive Enclave, Green Valley, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad -500034, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
8. M/s. Zee Media Corporation Limited, (operating the Telugu news television channel Zee Telugu News and the Hindi/English news television channel Zee News), having its office at Plot No. 96, Road No. 44, Kavuri Hills, Madhapur, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500033, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
9. M/s. CVR News Telugu, a Telugu news television channel, having its office at Plot No. 537J, Road No. 82. Co-operative House Building Society, Navanirman Nagar Colony, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500096. Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
10. M/s. Truth Serum Media Pvt. Ltd., (operating the digital news platform Hyderabad Mail), having its office at Road No. 15, Venkateshwara Colony. Saroornagar, Hyderabad -500035, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
11. M/s. RTV News Network., (operating the YouTube news channels RTV and RTV Nellore), having its office at Plot No. 770, Road No. 44, CBI Colony, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500033, Telangana, Email. Digital@rtvnewsnetwork.com, represented by its Editor / Director.
12. M/s. Tolivelugu, (Operating a YouTube Channel, a YouTube news and entertainment Channel), having its office at 6/4, Sai Nagar, Nagole, Hyderabad- 500068, Telangana, Represented by its Editor/ Director
13. M/s. Big TV, (operating multiple YouTube channels including BIG TV Live, BIG TV Andhra Pradesh, BIG TV Local, BIG TV Crime and BIG TV Nalgonda), having its office at Dwarka Trident, Kavuri Hills, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad -500033, Telangana, represented by its Director.
14. M/s. Ushodaya Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., (operating the Telugu daily newspaper Eenadu and its digital edition eenadu.net), having its office at Pillar No. 21, Flat No. 301, Main Road, Above State Bank of Hyderabad (Opp.), Moosapet, Hyderabad -500018, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
15. M/s. Network18 Media & Investments Limited., (operating the Telugu news television channel News18 Telugu and its digital edition). having its office at D. No. 6-3-902/A, 4th Floor, Plot No. 9, Central Plaza, Raj Bhavan Road, Somajiguda, Hyderabad -500082, Telangana, Phone. +91-40-40349000, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
16. M/s. Namaste Telangana., (operating the Telugu daily newspaper Namaste Telangana and its digital edition), having its office at # 8-2-603'1/7, 8 & 9, Krishnapuram, Road No. 10. Banjara Hills, Hyderabad -500034, Telangana. Phone. +91 40 2329 1999, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
17. M/s. Filmy Focus, (operating the digital entertainment news platform filmyfocus.com). the postal address whereof is not known to the Plaintiff. Email. Admin@filmyfocus.com., represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
18. M/s. NewsBytes Tech, (operating the digital news platform NewsBytesTelugu / newsbytesapp.com), having its office at 105 The Octagon, #07-02 Cecil

Street, Singapore, Phone. + 65 242890, Email. [contact@newsbytesapp.com](mailto:contact@newsbytesapp.com), represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.

19. M/s. Vaartha, (operating the Telugu daily newspaper Vaartha and its digital edition). the postal address whereof is not known to the Plaintiff, Phone. 9848112870, Email. [epaper@vaartha.com](mailto:epaper@vaartha.com), represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
20. M/s. Jagati Publications Limited, (operating the Telugu daily newspaper Sakshi and its digital editions [sakshi.com](http://sakshi.com) and [sakshipost.com](http://sakshipost.com)), having its registered office at 6-3-249/1, Sakshi Towers, Road No. 1, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad -500034, Telangana, represented by its Authorised Representative, Email. [companysecretary@sakshi.com](mailto:companysecretary@sakshi.com).
21. M/s. One.in Digitech Media Pvt. Ltd., (operating the digital news platform One India Telugu / [telugu.oneindia.com](http://telugu.oneindia.com)), having its office at VRR Legacy, No. 2, 1st Main Cross, 2nd Floor, 1st Block, Koramangala, Jakkasandra Extension, Bengaluru -560034, Karnataka, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
22. M/s. Tupaki, (operating the Telugu digital news platform [tupaki.com](http://tupaki.com)), the postal address whereof is not known to the Plaintiff, Email. [admin@tupaki.com](mailto:admin@tupaki.com), represented by its Editor-in-Chief Director.
23. M/s. Prashanthi Media Pvt. Ltd., (operating the Telugu daily newspaper Disha Daily and its digital edition [dishadaily.com](http://dishadaily.com)), having its office at Flat No. 101. House No. 6-3-571/1, First Floor, Diamond Block, Lumbini Rockdale, Somajiguda, Hyderabad -500082, Telangana, Phone. 040-48546963, Email. [feedback@dishadaily.com](mailto:feedback@dishadaily.com), represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
24. M/s. Greynium Information Technologies Pvt. Ltd., (operating the digital entertainment news platform Filmibeat Telugu / [filmibeat.com](http://filmibeat.com)), having its office at VRR Legacy, No. 2, 1st Main Cross, 4th Floor, 1st Block, Koramangala, Jakkasandra Extension, Bengaluru -560034, Karnataka. Email. [inquiries@greynium.com](mailto:inquiries@greynium.com), -represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
25. M/s. Dakshin Digital Media Pvt. Ltd., (operating the digital news platform The South First / [thesouthfirst.com](http://thesouthfirst.com)), having its office at Flat 501, Manbhuvan Venkys Apartment, Raj Bhavan Road, Somajiguda. Hyderabad -500082, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
26. M/s. The Siasat Daily, (operating the daily newspaper The Siasat Daily and its digital edition [siasat.com](http://siasat.com)), having its office at Jawaharlal Nehru Road, Abids, Hyderabad -500001, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
27. M/s. Deccan Chronicle Holdings Limited, (operating the daily English newspaper Deccan Chronicle and its digital edition [deccanchronicle.com](http://deccanchronicle.com)). having its corporate office at 36, Sarojini Devi Road, Secunderabad -500003, Telangana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
28. M/s. Times Internet, (operating the daily English newspaper The Times of India and its digital edition [timesofindia.indiatimes.com](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com)), having its office at Ecstasy IT Park, Plot 391, Udyog Vihar Phase 3, Gurugram -122016, Haryana, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
29. M/s. The Times Group / Times Network, (operating the English news television channel Times Now and its digital news platform), having its office at Sunteck Icon, BKC Junction, BKC-CST Link Road, Santacruz East. Mumbai -400098, Maharashtra, Email. [info@timesnow.tv](mailto:info@timesnow.tv), represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.

30. M/s. 123Telugu, (operating the digital entertainment news platform 123telugu.com), the postal address whereof is not known to the Plaintiff, Email. 123telugu@live.com, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
31. M/s. Gulte, (operating the digital news and entertainment platform gulte.com), having its office at 1/212-B, Road No. 76. Jubilee Hills. Hyderabad -500096, Telangana, Email. admin@gulte.com, represented by its Editor-in-Chief / Director.
32. M/ s. Google LLC -India Liaison Officer, (intermediary that operates and hosts the video-sharing platform YouTube, on which several of the offending videos and broadcasts of the Defendants No. 2 to 33 are hosted, indexed, recommended and monetised), having its India office at Unit No. 26, The Executive Centre, Level 8, DLF Centre, Sansad Marg, Connaught Place, New Delhi -110001, Email. support-in@google.com, represented by its Resident Grievance Officer for YouTube.
33. M/s. Meta Platforms Inc., (intermediary that operates and hosts the social-media platforms Instagram, Facebook and Threads, on which several of the offending videos, posts, stories and reels of the Defendants No. 2 to 33 are hosted, indexed and recommended), having its India office at Unit Nos. 28 and 29, The Executive Centre, Level 18. DLF Cyber City, Building No. 5, Tower A, Phase III, Gurgaon -122002. Haryana, Email. FBGOindia@fb.com, represented by its Grievance Officer for India.

...Respondents

**I.A. NO: 2 OF 2026**

Petition under Section Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 RW Sec.151 of Crpc praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant a Ex party- temporary Injunction Under Section 39 (1) and (2) of CPC by injuncting the Respondent No. 1, his successors, agents, representatives and anybody acting through or under him, to forthwith take down, withdraw, cause to be retracted and not to further publish or exhibit any defamatory complaint, statement, allegation, narrative, interview, byte, post or communication uttered, made, supplied or caused to be supplied by him or on his behalf to the Respondent No. 2 to 31 or to any other person or platform whatsoever against the Plaintiff or any other person in connection with FIR No. 78 of 2026 dated 20.04.2026 of the Central Crime Station, Detective Department, Hyderabad, to Injunct the Respondent No.2-31 by ordering takedown of already published defamatory complaint, statement, allegation, narrative, interview, byte, post or communication and to Injunct the Respondent No.32-33 by ordering takedown of already published defamatory complaint, statement, allegation, narrative, interview, byte, post or communication not to further publish the same.

**Counsel for the Petitioners: Sri. V. Murali Manohar**

**Counsel for the Respondents: None Appeared**

**The Court made the following: ORDER**

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.SAM KOSHY**

**Civil Revision Petition No.1346 of 2026**

**Date of Order :: 29.04.2026**

Between:

Ms.Venkata Aswini Reddy Koyya @ Ashu Reddy  
...Petitioner

AND

Mr. Yenumula Satyanarayana Murthy and 32 others  
...Respondents

**ORDER:**

The instant Civil Revision Petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India assailing the order dated 28.04.2026 in I.A.No.576 of 2026 in O.S.No.176 of 2026 passed by the XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, at Hyderabad, insofar as the Trial Court declined to grant *ex parte* ad interim injunction notwithstanding the urgency demonstrated on the face of affidavit and material on record, (for short, 'the impugned order').

2. Heard Mr. V. Murali Mohan, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. *Vide* the impugned order, the Trial Court directed issuance of summons to the respondents and posted the matter on 06.07.2026.
4. The petitioner filed the above suit, viz., O.S.No.176 of 2026 under Section 26 read with Order VII Rule 1 and 2 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908 seeking for mandatory and perpetual injunction by restraining defendant Nos.2 to 31, their respective agents, employees, servants, representatives and successors from further publishing, uploading, telecasting, sharing or in any manner disseminating any video, image, article, headline, caption, etc., on the on-line video sharing platforms, websites, YouTube Channels, social media handles, television Channels, newspapers or any other medium whatsoever, which defames, imputes or denigrates the petitioner herein.
5. Along with the said suit, the petitioner has filed I.A.No.576 of 2026 under Section 39(1) and (2) of Civil Procedure Code, 1908 praying the Trial Court for a temporary injunction by restraining respondent No.1, his successor, agents, representatives to forthwith take down, withdraw, cause to be retracted and to not further publish or exhibit any defamatory complaint, statement, allegation, narrative, interview, byte, post or communication uttered, made, supplied or caused to be supplied

by respondent No.1 or on his behalf to respondent Nos.2 to 31 or to any other person or platform whatsoever against the petitioner in connection with F.I.R.No.78 of 2026, dated 20.04.2026; and to injunct respondent Nos.2 to 31 by ordering take down of already published defamatory complaint, statement, allegation, narrative, interview, byte, post or communication.

6. On 28.04.2026, the Trial Court passed the following order, viz.,

*"Issue summons to the defendant; for appearance, call on 06.07.2026; I.A.No.576 of 2026 – Heard, the learned counsel for petitioner / plaintiff. Perused the material available on record. However, circumstances stated in the petition affidavit as the reason mentioned this Court deem it just and necessary to issue urgent notice to the respondents returnable by 06.05.2026."*

7. Perusal of the above order would show that the Trial Court has given a short date for the petitioner / plaintiff to serve notice on the respondents and adjourned the matter to 06.07.2026 for taking up I.A.No.576 of 2026 which is an application filed under Section 39(1) and (2) of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking for temporary injunction.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner herein is an actress in the film industry and earns her own living from

assignments in various films, web series, television shows, brand and public relations associations, marketing campaigns and life engagements.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner, meanwhile referring to the contents that are reflected in the above suit starting from paragraph No.9 onwards of the suit which are clippings from various websites, television channels and also videos uploaded in the YouTube and other website, whereby the petitioner had been projected as "Villain" and person of low character, submitted that the said content had tarnished the image of petitioner and had also adversely affected her personal as well as professional life; and therefore, contended that till the matter is taken up by the Trial Court, the respondents herein may be restrained from further damaging the image of petitioner by not publishing anything in news channels, television channels, web platforms, websites, YouTube channels, social media, newspapers, etc., which are otherwise defamatory and also harmful so far as petitioner is concerned.

10. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on a decision of the High Court of Madras in the case of **Kanimozhi Karunanidhi and others vs. Thiru. P. Varadarajan and**

others<sup>1</sup>, wherein a learned Single Judge held at paragraph Nos.30, 42 and 43 which for ready reference are reproduced as under, viz.,

*"30. The learned Judge has further observed as follows, viz.*

*"475. An individual has a right to protect his reputation from being unfairly harmed and such protection of reputation needs to exist not only against falsehood but also certain truths. It cannot be said that a more accurate judgment about people can be facilitated by knowing private details about their lives – people judge us badly, they judge us in haste, they judge out of context, they judge without hearing the whole story and they judge with hypocrisy. Privacy lets people protect themselves from these troublesome judgments."*

.....

*42. In balancing the two rights viz. the Right to Privacy and the Right to Freedom of Speech, the element of public interest is always based as a touch stone. The fact, as to whether, the former husband of the applicant is or was the owner of an estate near the location, where the fire accident happened recently may be of some interest to the public, but definitely cannot be said to be in public interest. Similarly, there are several other articles published by the respondents, which suggest strained relationship between her and her brother (who also happens to be a prominent politician), some talk of her relationship between her and a Police Officer, some attributing certain motives in her meeting with a Union Minister and certain cartoons and caricatures, which refer to the detention of the applicant etc. Of*

---

<sup>1</sup> MANU/TN/2339/2018, dated 16.05.2018

*course, the veracity of those statements made in those articles or the question as to whether they are defamatory in nature or not will have to be decided only after trial, but at the same time the respondents, in my considered opinion, cannot be allowed to go on publishing articles, which do not relate to the public life of the applicant, as a member of the parliament or as a leader of the political party or as a daughter of the former Chief Minister or as a sister of the former Deputy Chief Minister.*

43. *Therefore, in my considered opinion, in the light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Justice K.S.Puttaswamy's case, relating to the Right to Privacy, I am constrained to conclude that though there cannot be a blanket injunction as rightly contended by Mr.Sathish Parasaran, at the same time, there cannot be an order in favour of the respondents enabling them to publish anything and everything in the guise of public interest. I am therefore, of the opinion that the order of injunction granted of 05.01.2014 and modified by the order dated 25.04.2016 is to be made absolute, subject to the following conditions.*

*(i) The respondents shall not publish anything regarding the private life of the applicant, viz., her family, her marriage, procreation, motherhood, child-bearing and education, without the consent of the applicant.*

*(ii) Whenever, the respondents propose to publish any article relating to the private life of the applicant, claiming that it is in public interest, the respondents shall forward their queries/gist or the full article to the applicant to her email ID (to be furnished) and await for her response. If any response is received within 48 hours, the response shall also be published with the same prominence of the article. If no*

*response is received within the 48 hours, the respondents will be at liberty to go ahead and published the article.*

11. Therefore, it is well settled that the right to privacy is an intrinsic facet of the right to life and personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution. The right to privacy is not confined to mere secrecy, but includes the right of an individual to preserve dignity, reputation, autonomy and to control dissemination of personal information. The injury caused by unauthorized publication of personal and private material, particularly in the digital space is immediate, pervasive and often incapable of being remedied fully by subsequent damages.

12. This Court is also conscious that freedom of speech and expression under Article 19(1)(a) is a cherished constitutional value. However, the said right is not absolute and is subject to reasonable restrictions under Article 19(2) including in relation to defamation and other legitimate interests. In matters where the content complained of pertains predominantly to private life and is projected in a manner which is prima facie defamatory and sensational, the balance of convenience would ordinarily tilt in favour of protecting the dignity and privacy of the individual, at least till the competent Court adjudicates the issue on merits.

13. In the present case, the petitioner has placed material to demonstrate that the impugned publications, if permitted to continue, would result in irreversible harm to her privacy, reputation and livelihood. Once a narrative is repeatedly circulated through multiple platforms, the petitioner may be subjected to continuing public judgment and stigma which cannot be meaningfully undone even if she ultimately succeeds in the suit. Therefore, an interim restraint is needed until the Trial Court decides the injunction application, so that justice is protected and the case does not become meaningless.

14. Conscious of the fact that the matter is now seized by the Trial Court for hearing on 06.05.2026 in I.A.No.576 of 2026, this Court does not come in the way of Trial Court in taking an independent decision in the said I.A. At the same time, taking strength from the judgment in **Kanimozhi Karunanidhi** (supra), this Court is also of the view that if respondents continue to take up the issue of petitioner in the mainstream of television channels, websites, YouTube, etc., the very purpose of filing the above suit and the very purpose of seeking injunction in itself would get lost. Moreover, if the injunction application stands decided on merits, the respondents would be free to take appropriate legal recourse

thereafter basing on the outcome of the said I.A., which would include the steps that they are presently pursuing. Till then, at least, an element of restraint is definitely required so as to ensure that privacy of petitioner is honored at least till the courts take an independent view on the said application.

15. In the light of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to allow the Civil Revision Petition at this juncture restraining the respondent Nos.2 to 33 from publishing anything that is defamatory in the form of statements, allegations, narratives, interviews and other communications in newspapers, television channels, websites, YouTube channels, social media and other platforms till I.A.No.576 of 2026 in O.S.No.176 of 2026 is heard and decided by the Trial Court which is otherwise fixed on 06.05.2026. It is necessary to make it clear that the Trial Court is expected to take an independent decision on the said application on its own merits in accordance with law without being in any manner influenced by the observations or the order passed by this Court in the instant Civil Revision Petition.

16. With these observations, the Civil Revision Petition stands allowed. No costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending if any, shall stand closed.

SD/- K.V.O. NARSI BABU  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

  
SECTION OFFICER

**One Fair Copy to the Hon'ble SRI JUSTICE P SAM KOSHY  
(For His Lordships kind Persual)**

To,

1. The XI Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court at Hyderabad.
2. 11 LR Copies
3. The Under Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
4. The Secretary, Advocates Association Liberty, High Court for the State of Telangana, High Court Buildings at Hyderabad
5. One CC to Sri. V. Murali Manohar, Advocate [OPUC]
6. Two CD Copies

GNK



**HIGH COURT**

**DATED: 29/04/2026**



**ORDER**

**CRP.No.1346 of 2026**

**ALLOWING THE CIVIL REVISION PETITION  
WITHOUT COSTS**

*(18) SR*  
*30/4/26*