

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.11.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

C.S.No.939 of 2009

And

A.No. 133 of 2010

P.S.Srinivasan

... Plaintiff

Vs.

1. P.S.Vaidyanathan

2. Mr.Arjundas Pokardas

3. Gemini Color Laboratory
No. 28 New Bangaru Colony
West KK Nagar, Chennai – 600 078

... Defendants

PRAYER : This Civil Suit filed under Order VI Rule 1 O.S. Rules and Order VII Rule 1 CPC, praying for the following reliefs:

(a) for declaration that the plaintiff is the absolute owner of the limited copyright namely the executive and entire world Satellite Television Rights, including India with rights to transfer into U-matic tape, disc, or any formats of his choice either by himself or his order for a period of 99 years in the picture “Unnai Kann Theduthe” starring Udaya, Manya, Vinu Chakravarthy, Delhi Ganesh, Kalairani, etc., and directed by Ratheesh Ramayya for perpetual period;

(b) for permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents, officers, etc., from, interfering or infringing the plaintiff's limited copyright namely the exclusive and entire World Satellite Television Rights, including India with rights to transfer into U-matic tape, disc, or any formats of his choice either by himself or his order for a period of 99 years in the picture "Unnai Kann Theduthe" starring Udaya, Manya, Vinu Chakravarthy, Delhi Ganesh, Kalairani, etc., and directed by Ratheesh Ramayya for perpetual period; and

(c) for cost of the suit.

For Plaintiff : No appearance

For 3rd Defendant : M/s. R.Maheswari

JUDGMENT

There was no representation by the learned counsel for the plaintiff. The plaintiff had not responded by giving necessary instructions to him.

2. A memo was also filed that he had also sent an intimation and the cover sent by the learned counsel had been returned. This Court had directed the office to also issue notice to the plaintiff. Accordingly, the office issued notice and on 01.11.2016. The bailiff personally went to the address of the plaintiff but was not able to serve notice.

3. It is very clear that the plaintiff is not interested in prosecuting the case. The suit is dismissed for non-prosecution, with costs of the third defendant. Consequently, connected application is also dismissed.

Vsg

16.11.2016

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN ,J.

vsg

C.S.No.939 of 2009

And

A.No. 133 of 2010

16.11.2016

<http://www.judis.nic.in>