



\$~21

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

+ **CS(OS) 954/2025 & I.A. 32508-32514/2025**

**YERRAM VENKATA SUBBA REDDY & ANR. ....Plaintiffs**

Through: Mr. Dayan Krishnan, Senior Advocate with Mr. Amit Agrawal, Mr. Sahil Raveen, Mr. Rahul Kukreja, Mr. Jatin Shrivastava, Ms. Radhika Yadav and Ms. Akanksha Chauhan, Advocates

versus

**USHODAYA ENTERPRISES  
PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.**

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Shiv Vinayak Gupta, Ms. Bina Gupta and Ms. Anushka Rawal, Advocates for D-5 and D-6  
Ms. Mamta Rani, Ms. Shruttima Ehersa, Mr. Rohan Ahujha, Ms. Aiswarya Debardarshini and Ms. Jahanvi Agarwal, Advocates for D-9

**CORAM:  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

% **23.12.2025**

**I.A. 32509/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Commercial Courts Act)**

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiffs seeking leave to file additional documents under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015.
2. The plaintiffs are permitted to file additional documents in accordance



with the provisions of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

3. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

**I.A. 32510/2025, I.A. 32511/2025, I.A. 32512/2025, I.A. 32513/2025**  
**(exemption)**

4. Allowed, subject to plaintiffs filing typed/translated/certified copies documents on record within four weeks.

5. The plaintiffs are exempted from filing original documents at this stage.

6. The applications stand disposed of.

**I.A. 32514/2025 (seeking permission to file a pen driver containing impugned videos)**

7. This application is filed by the plaintiffs seeking permission to file impugned video recordings in pen drive.

8. For the reasons stated in the application, the plaintiffs are permitted to file impugned video recordings in pen drive.

9. The application stands disposed of.

**CS(OS) 954/2025**

10. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

11. Issue summons.

12. Summons are accepted by counsel appearing for the defendants no.5, 6 and 9. Let a copy of the complete set of the plaint paper-book be supplied to counsel for the defendants no.5, 6 and 9 by way of an e-mail during the course of the day.

13. Summons be issued to the remaining defendants through all permissible modes.



14. The summons shall state that the written statement(s) shall be filed by the defendants within thirty days from the date of the receipt of summons. Along with the written statement(s), the defendants shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the plaintiffs, without which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

15. Liberty is given to the plaintiffs to file replication, if any, within thirty days from the receipt of the written statement(s). Along with the replication filed by the plaintiffs, affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the defendants be filed by the plaintiffs.

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

17. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the timelines.

18. List on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.

**I.A. 32508/2025 (u/O-XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908)**

19. The present suit has been filed seeking an injunction along with other consequential reliefs against defamatory publications/posts/articles made against the plaintiffs by the defendants no.1 to 8.

20. It is the case of the plaintiffs that the defamatory statements have been made by the defendants alleging wrongdoings by the plaintiffs in procurement of ghee for the Lord Sri Venkateswara Swamy Temple of Tirumala which is one of the holiest shrines to all persons who are following faith of Hinduism. Plaintiff no.1 was the Chairman of the Board of the Committee of Management of Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanams ('TTD') and held the said position from June 2019 to August 2023.



21. Mr. Dayan Krishnan, senior counsel appearing for the plaintiffs, has drawn attention of the Court to the orders passed by the Supreme Court dated 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2024 and 4<sup>th</sup> October, 2024 in W.P.(C) No. 628/2024, in support of his submission that the matter relating to the Tirupati Tirumala laddu adulteration is pending investigation and therefore, the defendants cannot publish such defamatory publications/posts/articles at this stage.
22. Issue notice.
23. Notice is accepted by counsel for defendants no.5, 6 and 9.
24. Let notice be issued to remaining defendants through all modes.
25. Reply(ies) be filed within four (4) weeks.
26. Rejoinder(s) thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.
27. It is well-settled that *ex-parte ad interim* injunctions could only be granted under exceptional circumstances. Reference in this regard may be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Bloomberg Television Production Services India Private Limited v. Zee Entertainment Enterprises Limited***, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 426.
28. Therefore, at this stage, the Court is not inclined to grant an *ex-parte ad interim* injunction against the defendants *qua* the impugned publications/posts/articles. In my *prima facie* view, it would only be reasonable to give an opportunity to the defendants to present their defence in respect of their publications/posts/articles.
29. However, it is made clear that any publications/posts/articles made after today would be after being put to the notice by this Court and would have its own consequences.
30. List on 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2026.



**DECEMBER 23, 2025**  
**ds**

**AMIT BANSAL, J**