





O.A.No.588 of 2022 in C.S.No.189 of 2022

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.

Heard Mr.V.Raghavachari, learned counsel for the plaintiff.

2.The suit had been filed seeking damages to a sum of Rs.1,00,10,000/- against the defendant for alleged comments which he had expressed, which according to the plaintiff are defamatory in nature and not based on facts.

3.I am deeply conscious that this order is passed only on the basis of the materials presented by the plaintiff before the Court.

4.It is also to be expressed that if ever anybody either through the print media or through electronic media or in any other form seeks to voice out opinion, caution should be exercised and a code should also be maintained that such opinion should be put forth in the first instance to the person who would be either directly or indirectly affected by such opinion expressed, obtain their remarks on the same and then put forward both the opinion and the remarks as an information to be disseminated to the general public and leave it to the general public to form their opinion.





C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.

smv

5.Expressing opinions without caution to facts would invite allegations that they are defamatory and only establishes that caution was not prudently exercised by the defendant and there was intent to defame the plaintiff.

6.The plaintiff is seriously aggrieved by the various statements made by the defendant. Those statements can be assessed only when they are put to test during the course of trial. But since such defamatory statements would prima facie affect the normal course of business and do not appear to be based on facts, and had not been put to the plaintiff, injunction naturally follows. Injunction is granted as prayed for.

7.Notice to the respondent / defendant through Court and also privately returnable by 29.09.2022.

8.Order 39 Rule 3A to be strictly complied with. The respondent / defendant is directed to adhere to the orders of injunction.

08.09.2022

smv

O.A.No.588 of 2022

n

C.S.No.189 of 2022