

MHCC010088132026



IN THE BOMBAY CITY CIVIL COURT FOR GREATER BOMBAY

NOTICE OF MOTION NO.103547 OF 2026

IN

SUIT NO.1471/2026

Shilpa Shetty Kundra

Age: 50

Occupation :

Address: 57/A, Kinara Building, Rajendra
S Jain Road, Jukarwadi, Juhu, Mumbai
400049

...Plaintiff.

VERSUS

Shamita Yadav

Age: 0

Occupation :

Address: unknown address

...Defendant.

Appearances :-

Advocate Pradeep D. Gandhi for Plaintiff.

None for defendant no.1 present.

CORAM: HIS HONOUR JUDGE

S.M. BUKKE

COURT ROOM NO.03

DATE: 17.07.2026

ORDER

(Dictated and Pronounced in open Court)

1. The present Notice of Motion has been preferred by the Applicants (Plaintiffs in Suit No. 1471/2026) seeking to restrain the Defendants from making, posting, issuing, disseminating, or communicating any defamatory, malicious, or scandalous statements, whether written or spoken, amounting to libel or slander against the Applicants through electronic or print media. The Applicants further seek directions to forthwith delete and remove the defamatory content at Exhibits B, C, D, and E to the plaint from all social media platforms.
2. Plaintiff No. 1, Shilpa Shetty Kundra, and Plaintiff No. 2, Raj Kundra, are renowned celebrities whose reputation and goodwill have been built over three decades across cinema, business, sports, and philanthropy.
3. Defendant No. 1, Shamita Yadav (@the.ranting.gola, with 1.6 million followers), published two defamatory video reels on 10th and 12th February 2026, falsely portraying the Plaintiffs as criminals, persons bereft of honour, and persons who “go after minors,” imputations that are per se actionable. The videos have been widely reposted and circulated, further amplified by Defendant No. 3 (John Doe). The Plaintiffs have instituted the present suit claiming damages and perpetual injunction.
4. The Applicants have filed this Notice of Motion seeking urgent ad-interim relief to restrain the Defendants from posting or circulating defamatory content. Affidavit of service (Exh. 06) shows Defendant No. 1 was served but remained absent. None appeared for Defendant Nos. 1 to 3.
5. Heard learned Advocate for the Applicants. Perused the record.
6. Learned Advocate for the Applicants submitted that Defendant No. 1 has made defamatory statements in electronic media, publishing videos that attack the moral character of the Plaintiffs. Reliance is placed on precedents including

- 1 B M Thimmaiya v TM Rukmini [ILR 2013 KAR 4163]
- 2 Kumar Sanu @Sanu Bhattacharjee v Ritu Bhattacharya [SUIT (L) NO.37043 OF 2025]
- 3 Physics Wallah v Nikhil Kumar and Ors [CS(COMM) 70/2026]
- 4 Karan Johar v/s Ajey Nagar & Ors. [S/100400/2026]
- 5 Salman Khan v. Ashok Kumar/John Doe & Ors. [CS(COMM) 1322/2025]
- 6 Konidala Pawan Kayan v X Corp [OC/3986/2026]
- 7 Swami Ramdev & Anr v. Facebook Inc & Ors [CS(OS) 27/2019]
- 8 X and Ors. v Jon Doe and Ors [CS(OS) 33/2026]
9. Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India (2016) 7 SCC 221

7. On perusal of the record, prima facie it appears that the Plaintiffs have instituted the present suit for perpetual and mandatory injunction alleging defamation, contending that Defendant No. 1 published defamatory content on Instagram. The impugned videos are prima facie not based on true facts. The Plaintiffs have demonstrated that the publications are false. The balance of convenience lies in favour of the Applicants. Defendant No. 1 cannot be permitted to publish false or exaggerated case law is applicable to the present Notice of Motion. In such circumstances, at this stage, the Plaintiffs are entitled to ad-interim temporary injunction restraining Defendant No. 1 from posting, publishing, or circulating defamatory content against the Plaintiffs until the next date of hearing. Hence following order;

ORDER

1. The defendant no.1 her agents and representatives are temporarily restrained till next date, from publishing, uploading, circulating, republishing or disseminating any defamatory, malicious, or scandalous statement(s), allegations, or insinuations, whether written or spoken, amounting to libel

and/or slander against the Plaintiffs, their companies through any electronic or other medium.

2. The defendant no.1 shall withdraw and remove forthwith any defamatory contents annex Exh- B, C, D, E to the plaint from any and all social media platforms or any other medium.

3. Issue notice to all defendants asking why the aforesaid order shall not be made absolute.



(S.M. BUKKE)
Judge,
City Civil Court,
Gr. Mumbai.

Date: 17.07.2026

1. Pronounced on	: 17.07.2026
2. Directly Dictated on	: 17.07.2026
3. Checked on	: 17.07.2026
4. Printed on	: 17.07.2026
5. Signed on	: 17.07.2026

“CERTIFIED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL SIGNED JUDGMENT/ORDER”	
UPLOAD DATE AND TIME	17.07.2026/ 6.35 p.m
NAME OF STENOGRAPHER	Dipak Ashok Morade (Clerk- Typist)
Name of the Judge (with Court Room no.)	HHJ Shri. S.M. Bukke (Court Room No.03).
Date of Pronouncement of Judgment/Order	17.07.2026
Judgment/Order signed by P.O. on	17.07.2026
Judgment/Order uploaded on	17.07.2026

