



\$~35

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ CS(OS) 297/2026, I.A. 9323/2026, I.A. 9324/2026, I.A. 9325/2026,  
I.A. 9326/2026, I.A. 9327/2026 & I.A. 9328/2026

**BPTP LIMITED**

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Jayant Mehta, Sr. Adv. with Mr.  
Aseem Chaturvedi, Mr. Milind Jain,  
Advocates (M:9999700647)

versus

**NITIN NARESH & ORS.**

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Shahil Rao, Ms. Komal Jain, Ms.  
Irshita Gupta, Ms. Damini Yadav, Mr.  
Rahul Yadav, Advocates along with  
Defendant no. 1 in person  
(M:9999025817)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA**

**ORDER**

%

**07.04.2026**

**I.A. 9325/2026 (Exemption)**

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application is disposed of.

**I.A. 9326/2026**

3. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff seeking enlargement of time for filing the Court Fees.
4. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff submits that the requisite Court Fees shall be deposited, within a period of two days from today.
5. Accordingly, let the Court Fees be deposited by the plaintiff, within a period of one week from today.



6. Noting the aforesaid, the present application is disposed of.

**I.A. 9327/2026**

7. The present application has been filed under Order XIII Rule 1, read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (“CPC”), seeking extension of time to file original documents.

8. As per the application, the plaintiff has prayed for 8 weeks’ time to file the aforesaid documents. Accordingly, let original documents be filed within eight weeks.

9. Noting the aforesaid, the present application is disposed of.

**I.A. 9328/2026**

10. The present application has been filed seeking leave to file additional documents.

11. As per the application, thirty days’ time has been prayed for filing additional documents. Accordingly, let additional documents be filed within thirty days.

12. Noting the aforesaid, the present application is disposed of.

**I.A. 9324/2026**

13. The present application has been filed under Order II Rule 2, read with Section 151 of the CPC.

14. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the defendants.

15. Let reply be filed by the defendants, within a period of four weeks.

16. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks, thereafter.

**CS(OS) 297/2026**

17. Let the plaint be registered as suit.

18. Issue summons. Summons is accepted by learned counsel appearing



for the defendants.

19. Let written statement be filed by the defendants, within thirty (30) days from today. Along with the written statement, the defendants shall also file an affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of the plaintiff, without which, the written statement shall not be taken on record.

20. Liberty is given to the plaintiff to file replication, if any, within thirty (30) days from the receipt of the written statement. Along with the replication filed by the plaintiff, the affidavit of admission/denial of the documents of defendants be filed by the plaintiff, without which replication shall not be taken on record.

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

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

23. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2026.

24. List before the Court on 07<sup>th</sup> July, 2026, in the Top Ten Matters in the *Advance List*.

**I.A. 9323/2026 (Under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC)**

25. The captioned suit has been filed seeking a decree of permanent and mandatory injunction, thereby, restraining the defendants from publication of false, misleading and defamatory content pertaining to the plaintiff, and further seeking damages.

26. The present application has been filed seeking an order of interim injunction, thereby, restraining the defendants, from publishing any further content that egregiously harms the image/reputation of the plaintiff.

27. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff submits that the defendant



no. 1 is a Director and a Shareholder of defendant no. 3, i.e., Nine Network Private Limited, thereby, owning 50% of the same. He submits that, additionally, defendant no. 3 is also a lawyer and a partner in Jurist Legal LLP, and hands over document with regard thereto.

28. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff further draws the attention of this Court to the *Document-6* filed along with the present plaint, to submit that the E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2025 was received from defendant no. 1 by the plaintiff company, offering certain legal services. However, since the plaintiff did not respond to the letter of the defendant no. 1, he started a malicious campaign against the plaintiff company by writing sixteen articles in eight months, starting from July/August, 2025.

29. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff further submits that the aforesaid articles contain numerous false, malicious, and unverified allegations aimed directly at damaging the reputation of the plaintiff and its Managing Director (“MD”). The said articles includes allegations of scamming and conspiracy to defraud investors, defrauding real estate and home buyers aimed at particularly, thereby, impacting the reputation of the plaintiff at market place.

30. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff draws the attention of this Court to an order dated 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2022, passed in *CS(OS) 627/2022*, titled as “*Oravel Stays Limited Versus Nine Network Private Limited & Ors.*”, to submit that this Court has previously dealt with a case, wherein, defendant no. 1 was involved in a similar malicious campaign against another company. Defendant no. 1 has now resorted to a similar *modus operandi* in the present case as well, whereby, defendant no. 1 has been writing false and malicious articles against the plaintiff company and the



MD of the plaintiff company on the website, i.e., “www.inventiva.co.in”.

31. He further submits that after service of advance notice in the present case, defendant no. 1 has written a 17<sup>th</sup> article with regard to the plaintiff company, carrying out malicious campaign against the plaintiff.

32. *Per contra*, defendant no. 1, who appears in person, submits that he is only an operational partner and does not derive any salary, as such, from the said law firm.

33. He further submits that defendant no. 1 is mainly a journalist and writes different articles, which are published on the website of defendant no. 3. He submits that there has been a Report from the Enforcement Directorate (“ED”) with regard to a raid being carried out by the ED against the plaintiff company. Additionally, there are multiple First Information Reports (“FIRs”) filed against the MD of the plaintiff company. Thus, the articles in question, written by defendant no. 1, are in the nature of fair comment and are not defamatory.

34. Defendant no. 1, appearing in person, further submits that besides the plaintiff company, there are various other articles with respect to various other companies also, which have been written by defendant no. 1, and are published on the website of defendant no. 3. Thus, it cannot be said that the defendant no. 1 is carrying out a malicious campaign to specifically target the plaintiff company.

35. He further submits that though a letter was written to the plaintiff company, however, the said E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2025 was not issued only to the plaintiff, but was also sent to various other companies. Further, the said letter to the plaintiff was sent by defendant no. 1, since one of the persons associated with the plaintiff, was on the LinkedIn profile of



defendant no. 1. Thus, he refutes the allegation that the articles in question were motivated because of lack of any response to the E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2025.

36. Responding to the aforesaid, learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff denies that the articles written by defendant no. 1 are in the nature of a fair comment and submits that defendant no. 1 is guilty of presenting the facts selectively and maliciously, in the manner of a *hyperbole*. Further there is no FIR, at present, against the MD of the plaintiff, and the FIR of the year 2011, against the MD of the plaintiff company, already stands quashed.

37. He further submits that defendant no. 1 does not deny writing the said E-mail dated 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2025 to the plaintiff, thereby, soliciting work.

38. Learned Senior Counsel for the plaintiff further submits that though the articles in question written by defendant no. 1 are published on the website of defendant no. 3, however, defendant no. 1 ought not to disseminate the said articles on other platforms.

39. In response, defendant no. 1, who is present in person, submits and undertakes that the articles in question, which have been published on the website of defendant no. 3, shall not be put or disseminated on any other social media platform.

40. The aforesaid statement of defendant no. 1 is taken note of and defendant no. 1 is held bound by the same.

41. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for defendant nos. 1 to 3.

42. Let reply be filed within a period of four weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks, thereafter.

43. In case, defendant no. 1 writes any other article in respect of any



future incident or occurrence *qua* the plaintiff or MD of the plaintiff, defendant no. 1 shall ensure that the same is in the nature of fair comment and fair reporting.

44. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2026.

45. List before the Court on 07<sup>th</sup> July, 2026 in the Top Ten Matters in the *Advance List*.

**MINI PUSHKARNA, J**

**APRIL 7, 2026/au**