



CNR: KAHC010439492026

NC: 2026:KHC:36987
WP No. 20090 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 20090 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

PARE INNOVATIONS PRIVATE LIMITED,
A COMPANY INCORPORATED
UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE
AT GALA NO. 101/102/103, KHOPAT,
THANE,
JAI COMMERCIAL COMPLEX,
OPP. CADBURY CO.,
1ST FLOOR,
MAHARASHTRA - 400 601.
REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORISED
REPRESENTATIVE,
MR. KUMAR RAJANIKANT MEHTA,

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. BALA NIKIT, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. VOX BUILDING PRODUCTS
PRIVATE LIMITED
A COMPANY INCORPORATED
UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
NO. 1202, 100 FEET ROAD,
HAL 2ND STAGE, DOMLUR,
INDIRANAGAR,
BENGALURU 560 008.
REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORISED
REPRESENTATIVE,





CNR: KAHC010439492026

MR. VARUN PODDAR

2. VOX INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR
SOLUTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED,
A COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER
THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
NO. 1202, 100 FEET ROAD,
HAL 2ND STAGE, DOMLUR,
INDIRANAGAR,
BENGALURU 560 008.
REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORISED
REPRESENTATIVE,
MR. VARUN PODDAR
3. MR. KUMUDCHANDRA NAYAK,
S/O MR. MADHAVLAL NAYAK,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
RESIDING AT C/604,
BLUE OASIS-1, BLUE EMPIRE COMPLEX,
OFF LINK ROAD, BANDAR PAKHADI ROAD,
NEAR EKTA NAGAR, CHARKOP,
KANDIVALI WEST, MUMBAI,
MAHARASHTRA -400 067
4. MR. SUSHIL DALVI,
SALES TEAM LEADER,
PARE INNOVATIONS PRIVATE LIMITED,
HAVING OFFICE AT
JAI COMMERCIAL COMPLEX,
OPP. CADBURY CO.,
1ST FLOOR, GALA NO. 101/102/103,
KHOPAT, THANE,
MAHARASHTRA - 400 601.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.ANUPURNA BORDOLOI, ADVOCATE FOR C/R1 & R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO DIRECTION IN
THE NATURE THEREOF, IN EXERCISE OF ITS SUPERVISORY



CNR: KAHC010439492026

NC: 2026:KHC:36987
WP No. 20090 of 2026

JURISDICTION UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, CALLING FOR THE RECORDS OF COM. O.S. NO. 698/2025 ON THE FILE OF THE LXXXII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE (COMMERCIAL COURT, CCH-83), BENGALURU, AND TO QUASH AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 15/04/2026 (ANNEXURE-A).

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

Aggrieved by the order dated 15.04.2026 passed in I.A.No.5 in Com.O.S.No.698/2025 by the LXXXII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru, the petitioner/defendant No.1 is before this Court.

2. The respondent Nos.1 and 2 herein, who are the plaintiffs, have filed Com.O.S.No.698/2025 seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendants from publishing, circulating, distributing the video or any part thereof and an order directing the defendants to issue a public apology and a formal retraction of the disparaging statements made against the plaintiffs' product, and also seeking an amount of Rs.10,00,00,000/- as damages for commercial disparagement,



loss of reputation, loss of business, and mental trauma and distress caused by the defendants' wrongful acts.

3. In the suit, the defendant No.1 has filed I.A.No.5 under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC seeking rejection of the plaint. According to the petitioner/defendant No.1, the Commercial Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit as stated in the plaint. The transactions are not commercial in nature, and the Commercial Court has no jurisdiction. It is not a commercial dispute, and no cause of action arose within the jurisdiction of the trial Court. Hence, there is no territorial jurisdiction. On these two grounds, an application is filed under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC.

4. The trial Court, by the impugned order, dismissed the application. While dismissing the application, the trial Court observed that the defendants circulated slanderous videos widely, targeting the plaintiffs' customers, and also approached the plaintiffs' customers, sending private messages and videos to avoid legal scrutiny. They committed this mischief against the plaintiff. Therefore, the video circulated is within the trial Court's jurisdiction, and the plaintiff has produced documents



and marketing accounts for the sale of his products worth Rs.14,11,60,876/- to establish his business in Bengaluru. The mail and the documents annexed to the plaint show that the plaintiff is running a business in the city of Bengaluru, and the WhatsApp chats show that the defendants were sending private messages to the plaintiff's customers. Therefore, a detailed trial is required, and without it, the Court cannot conclude that it lacks territorial jurisdiction.

5. The trial Court observed that the documents produced along with the plaint clearly disclose that the Court has territorial jurisdiction to entertain the suit. Further, regarding the commercial nature of the transaction, the trial Court observed that the judgments relied on by both parties. The videos were sent by the defendants through WhatsApp within the territorial jurisdiction of Bengaluru, in respect to the VOX panels and which causes damage to the business of the plaintiff. Therefore, the alleged dispute between the parties is commercial in nature. Though directly the acts alleged by the plaintiff against the defendants are affecting the business transactions of the plaintiff. Therefore, the suit comes within



the purview of commercial dispute and hence, both on territorial jurisdiction as well as otherwise, the trial Court has got the jurisdiction.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/defendant No.1 has argued on the merits and submits that the trial Court lacks territorial jurisdiction and that this is not a commercial transaction. Even on that count, the Commercial Court has no jurisdiction. It is the case that the trial Court failed to consider the objections raised by the petitioner, relied on several judgments and those judgments were not properly considered, and simply concluded that it is a commercial transaction and that it has jurisdiction.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2/plaintiffs submits that the trial Court has rightly considered all aspects and rightly passed an order, and no interference is called for.

8. Having heard the learned counsels on either side, perused the entire material on record. The defendant No.1 has filed an application under Order VII Rule 11 of the CPC and has



CNR: KAHC010439492026

NC: 2026:KHC:36987
WP No. 20090 of 2026

put forth his case before the trial Court. It is the case that the suit is not maintainable, that the Court lacks territorial jurisdiction, and that the transaction is not a commercial transaction. Both parties have also relied on certain judgments. This Court has perused the impugned order. The impugned order does not disclose consideration of any judgments relied on by the counsel for the petitioner and the respondents, and it is bereft of reasons. The trial Court has failed to give proper reasons for coming to such a conclusion. In that view of the matter, this Court deems it appropriate to pass the following order:

ORDER

- i. The order dated 15.04.2026 passed in I.A.No.5 in Com.O.S.No.698/2025 by the LXXXII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru, is **set aside** and the matter is **remanded back** to the trial Court for fresh consideration.
- ii. The trial Court shall consider I.A.No.5 within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
- iii. Accordingly, the writ petition is **allowed**.



**NC: 2026:KHC:36987
WP No. 20090 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010439492026

iv. All I.As. in this petition shall stand closed.

SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE

MEG
List No.: 1 SI No.: 33