

Heard the counsel for plaintiff on  
IA No.1 & 2 and perused the records.

As can be seen from the records, present suit is filed  
by the plaintiff against defendants for permanent

injunction restraining the defendants, their proprietors, editors, directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, assigns and all persons claiming through or under them from telecasting, re-telecasting, broadcasting, rebroadcasting, printing, publishing, republishing, transmitting, distributing, circulating, sharing, forwarding, uploading, hosting, displaying, communicating to the public or otherwise disseminating, in any print, newspaper, television, cable, radio, website, internet, social-media, digital or other medium whatsoever, the impugned video dated 27-09-2026 available at [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kIJWitcvrql>](<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kIJWitcvrql>), the impugned broadcast dated 02-10-2026 available at [<https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs>](<https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs>), the captions accompanying the same, and any clips, extracts, screenshots, transcripts, edited versions, reproductions or reports which reproduce, repeat or disseminate the allegations contained in or emanating from the said impugned material concerning the plaintiff and for Mandatory Injunction directing defendants No. 1 and 2 to forthwith remove / take down and cease to host,

display or make available the aforesaid impugned publications from the channels / accounts controlled by them and directing the concerned platform defendants (more particularly defendant Nos. 28 to 32), upon identification of the specific URLs / electronic locations, to disable access to the impugned material in accordance with the orders of this Court.

It is further seen from the records that the plaintiff has filed IA No.1 under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 R/w. Section 151 of CPC with a prayer to grant an ad-interim order of ex-parte temporary injunction restraining the defendants their proprietors, editors, directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, assigns and all persons claiming through or under them from telecasting, re telecasting, broadcasting, publishing, republishing, uploading, transmitting, circulating, sharing, hosting or otherwise disseminating, in any manner or through any medium whatsoever, the impugned video dated 27.09.2026 available at [HTTP://www.youtube.com/watch?v=klJWltcvrql](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=klJWltcvrql) and the impugned video/broadcast dated 02.10.2026 available at <https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs>, together

with the captions accompanying the same, or any part, clip, extract, screenshot, transcript, edited version, reproduction or substantially identical version thereof, and further restraining them from causing the said impugned videos or any portion thereof to be telecast, retelecast, uploaded, published or disseminated through any other account, channel, website, social-media platform or medium, pending disposal of the suit. An affidavit has been sworn in by the plaintiff and same is filed along with I.A.No.1.

The plaintiff has also filed I.A. No.2 under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 R/w. Section 151 of CPC with a prayer to grant an ad-interim order of ex-parte temporary injunction directing the defendants No. 28 to 32, insofar as applicable to their respective platforms and services, to forthwith disable access to and/or block the impugned videos/publications available at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=klJWltcvrql> and  
<https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs> and to restrain the said Defendants from continuing to host, display, transmit or otherwise facilitate dissemination of the aforesaid impugned material through their

respective platforms, pending disposal of the suit. An affidavit has been sworn in by the plaintiff and same is filed along with I.A.No.1.

It is contended in the applications that the plaintiff twice served as Chief Minister of Karnataka. He held several important constitutional, legislative and ministerial responsibilities, including the Finance portfolio and has been repeatedly elected to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly and presently the elected Member from Varuna Constituency. His public standing, goodwill and reputation has been built over decades of public service and repeated public mandates. The allegations contained in the impugned material strike directly at his personal dignity, reputation and standing in public life.

It is further contended that the recording purports to show two men and a woman in a conversation presented as a secret or hidden-camera interaction. The woman is prompted through a series of questions to make grave allegations relating to an alleged incident in or around the year 2011. The alleged event is stated to have occurred approximately fifteen years

prior to the publication; no contemporaneous complaint or independently verifiable material supporting the accusation is displayed in the publication. The extraordinary delay, the manner of questioning, the hidden-camera presentation and the politically loaded caption, followed by sudden digital publication, disclose a calculated and malicious design to cause maximum injury to my reputation and political standing. It is further contended that on 02-10-2026, the defendant No.1 streamed/ uploaded an approximately 1-hour program titled "LIVE: Biggest CD Blast in Karnataka Politics? | ರಾಜ್ಯ ರಾಜಕಾರಣದ ಬಿಗ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ CD ಸ್ಪೋಟ!?"

As on 04-10-2026, the broadcast had garnered approximately 3.24 lakh views. Defendant No.1 repeatedly projects the subject as a major political disclosure involving a senior political leader and as a matter capable of sending tremors through the politics of the State.

It is further contended that the second publication itself adverts to the fact that the alleged incident is said to be around fifteen years old and acknowledges questions concerning credibility, authenticity and

intention. Nevertheless, the broadcast repeatedly sensationalises the alleged material and carries the controversy to an audience of several lakhs without displaying any authentic recording of me or independently verified material establishing the allegations. The impugned material remains capable of being copied, clipped, telecast, retelecast, printed, published, republished, shared, forwarded and amplified across print, television and digital media. Every additional publication creates a fresh and continuing injury and exponentially enlarges the audience exposed to the allegation.

The defendants No.3 to 42 are print, television, digital and platform entities having substantial circulation, reach and the capacity for instantaneous dissemination. In the absence of immediate restraint, the impugned videos, captions, extracts, screenshots, transcripts and reproductions can be multiplied across such media within minutes, thereby frustrating the very subject matter of the suit. Therefore, it will cause injury to his reputation and irreparable loss, which cannot be adequately compensated in terms of money. A reputation built over several decades of

public life cannot be restored merely by an award of damages after the impugned material has been multiplied across media and digital platforms. Copies, forwarded clips and screenshots may persist even after the original publication is eventually removed. Therefore, requested to grant ex-parte temporary injunction.

Heard arguments of learned Senior Advocate Vikram Huligal for Advocate Shathabish Shivanna. I have gone through the entire record along with the documents submitted by the plaintiff. In support of I.A.Nos.1 & 2, the plaintiff has produced the documents at Sl.Nos.1 to 8 i.e., Series of screenshots / printouts of defendant No.1, Pendrive containing Video No.1 published by defendant No.2 and Video No.2 published by defendant No.1, true typed copy of the transcript of the video No.1 dated 27-09-2026, true typed copy of the transcript of the video No.1 dated 02-10-2026 and Certificate under Section 63 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam, 2023 in respect of the electronic record relating to defendant No.1.

It is an undisputed fact that the plaintiff had twice

served as the Chief Minister of Karnataka and he held several important constitutional, legislative and ministerial responsibilities, including the Finance portfolio and on several times he elected to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly and presently elected as Member from Varuna Constituency. The right to privacy is an intrinsic part of right to life and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Indian Constitution.

The plaintiff has specifically disputed about the authenticity, credibility, intention and the propriety of circulation without verification. Under such circumstances, if the impugned materials, alleged objectionable videos are shared, circulated, published in the social media, print media, digital platform, T.V., will definitely cause immense damages to the dignity, status, position and reputation of the plaintiff in the public image and privacy of the plaintiff, which cannot be compensated in terms of money. And the very purpose of filing the suit becomes infructuous. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the plaintiff has made out prima facie case for grant of ad-interim order of ex-parte temporary injunction on I.A No.1 & 2. Hence I proceed to pass the following;

ORDER

Issue ad-interim exparte temporary injunction order against defendants restraining them, their proprietors, editors, directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, assigns and all persons claiming through or under them from telecasting, retelecasting, broadcasting, publishing, republishing, uploading, transmitting, circulating, sharing, hosting or otherwise disseminating, in any manner or through any medium whatsoever, the impugned video dated 27.09.2026 available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=klJWltcvrql> and the impugned video/broadcast dated 02.10.2026 available at

<https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs>, together with the captions accompanying the same, or any part, clip, extract, screenshot, transcript, edited version, reproduction or substantially identical version thereof, and further restraining them from causing the said impugned videos or any portion thereof to be telecast, retelecast, uploaded, published or disseminated through any other account, channel, website, social-media platform or medium and also

directing the defendants No. 28 to 32, insofar as applicable to their respective platforms and services, to forthwith disable access to and/or block the impugned videos/publications available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=klJWltcvrql> and <https://www.youtube.com/live/DohZg7litAs> and to restrain the said Defendants from continuing to host, display, transmit or otherwise facilitate dissemination of the aforesaid impugned material through their respective platforms till next date.

In view of the above said order, plaintiff shall comply the provision of Order XXXIX Rule 3(a) of C.P.C.

Further, the plaintiff shall pay the requisite process fee and furnish sufficient copies within stipulated period.

If the plaintiff fails to comply the above said order, in such circumstances, the above said exparte order stands automatically cancelled.

Office is directed to issue certified copy of the exparte order only after compliance of above said order by the plaintiff.

O S No.7655/2026

Issue notice of I.A.No.1 & 2 to the  
defendants along with suit summons.

Returnable by

(Smt. B. Pushpanjali),  
XIX Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,  
Bengaluru City.