



\$~46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

CNR No. DLHC010413692026

+ **CS(OS) 786/2026**

CMYK PRINTECH LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Saurav Agrwal, Mr. Shan tanu Agarwal, Mr. Abhinav Tyagi, Mr. Vineeth Penmetba, Ms. Aparna Tiwari, Ms. Avisha Tiwari, Ms. Prachit Dubey, Mr. Anadi Mishra and Mr. Vikash Tomar, Advs.

versus

KALVAKUNTLA KAVITHA & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Dhananjai Rana, CGSC and Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma, GP for R-19, 20.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **03.09.2026**

IA No.24192/2026 (seeking permission to file a lengthy synopsis and list of dates and events)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

IA No.24194/2026 (seeking extension of time for filing court fees)

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff submits that the requisite court fees shall be filed within a period of one week from today.
4. The application is disposed of.

IA No.24193/2026 (Exemption from giving written notice the Govt. authorities)

5. Issue notice.
6. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of defendant



nos.19 and 20.

7. Let notice be issued to the other defendants, on necessary steps being taken by the plaintiff, through all permissible modes, including electronically.

8. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

9. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 15.10.2026.

10. List on 04.02.2027.

IA No.24191/2026 (seeking permission to file pen drive containing impugned videos)

11. Considering the averments made in the application, the same is allowed.

12. The application stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 786/2026

13. Issue summons in the suit.

14. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts summons on behalf of defendant nos.19 and 20.

15. On filing of process fee, let summons be issued to the other defendants by all permissible modes.

16. The summons shall indicate that written statement must be filed within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons. The defendants shall also file an affidavit of admission/ denial of the documents filed by the plaintiff, failing which the written statement shall not be taken on record.

17. The plaintiff is at liberty to file replication thereto within thirty days after filing of the written statement. The replication shall be accompanied by affidavit of admission/ denial in respect of the documents filed by the



defendants, failing which the replication shall not be taken on record.

18. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.

19. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

20. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 15.10.2026 for completion of service, pleadings, admission/ denial of documents and marking of exhibits.

21. List in Court on 04.02.2027.

IA No.24190/2026 (interim injunction)

22. Issue notice.

23. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of defendant nos.19 and 20.

24. Let notice be issued to the other defendants, on necessary steps being taken by the plaintiff, through all permissible modes, including electronically.

25. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed before the next date of hearing.

26. The plaintiff / M/s CMYK Printech Limited is the owner / publisher of 'The Pioneer' newspaper.

27. The plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking appropriate relief against the defendants on account of alleged false, defamatory and malicious statements made by the defendant no.1 concerning the plaintiff and its publication / newspaper i.e. 'The Pioneer'.

28. It is submitted that the defamatory statements initially published by the defendant no.1 have been reproduced, republished, circulated and



amplified by the remaining defendants across various electronic and digital media platforms causing serious and continuing injury to the plaintiff's goodwill, reputation and business operations.

29. The defamatory statements by the defendant no.1 were first published in a Youtube livestream on 09.07.2026 wherein it was alleged that the plaintiff's newspaper had been purchased by a political personality for a sum of Rs.188 Crores and that the newspaper was being controlled by a political party.

30. The plaintiff contends that these allegations are *per se* false and defamatory and that neither any political person nor any political party has any control or say or has acquired or controlled the plaintiff's newspaper.

31. It is submitted that the damage being caused to the plaintiff on account of the defamatory statements and imputations is irreparable and continuing. This is particularly on account of the global accessibility of the impugned content on digital and social media platforms. It is submitted that this court has territorial jurisdiction to entertain and adjudicate this suit inasmuch as the plaintiff's registered office and corporate office are situated in Delhi and the impugned statements have been extensively circulated in Delhi and have caused substantial injury in Delhi.

32. In this regard, reliance is placed on the judgment of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Sameer Dnyandev Wankhede Vs Red Chillies Entertainments Pvt. Ltd., Through Its Authorised Representative and Others*** 2026 SCC OnLine Del 333 wherein it has been observed that:-

“66. From the discussion above, in relation to Section 19 of the CPC and the wrong of cyber/online defamation, the following conclusions may be drawn:

66.1 Where the wrong has not been done within the jurisdiction of more than one Court:



- a. *The plaintiff may sue at the place where he resides, or in the case of a company, the place where it has its registered office. When he/it sues at such a natural forum, there is no requirement to specifically plead in whose eyes the reputation of the plaintiff has been lowered; and*
- b. *The plaintiff is also entitled to sue at the place where he is not resident, or in the case of company, a place where it is not registered, but in such a case, he/it is required to plead in whose eyes the reputation of the plaintiff has been lowered.*

66.2 *Where the wrong has been done within the jurisdiction of more than one Court:*

- c. *If wrong has also been done within the jurisdiction of the Court in which the defendant resides, carries on business or works for gain, the plaintiff must sue at this place of merger and at no place else; and*
- d. *If wrong has not been done within the jurisdiction of the Court in which the defendant resides, the plaintiff must sue at the place where maximum wrong has been done, which normally shall be where he is a resident or in case of a corporation, where it has its registered office. However, he/it can also sue at an unnatural forum, claiming maximum wrong to have been done there, if the wrong done at the natural forum, in comparison to the place in which the plaintiff seeks to sue, is miniscule.”*

33. Considering the circumstances, an *ad interim* order is passed restraining the defendant no.1 from publishing, re-publishing, broadcasting, circulating or disseminating in any manner, whether directly or indirectly, the defamatory statements and imputations complained of in the plaint, or any other content containing the same or similar allegations against the plaintiff and / or ‘The Pioneer’ on any platform. The defendant nos.2 to 15 are also restrained from making similar defamatory imputations against the plaintiff till the next of hearing.

34. The aforesaid defendants shall take down the offending publication / posts from their websites / platforms / social media.

35. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 15.10.2026.

36. List in Court on 04.02.2027.



37. Let compliance with the provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 be done within a period of one week from today.

SEPTEMBER 3, 2026/cl

SACHIN DATTA, J