

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION)

FRIDAY, THE 28TH DAY OF JUNE 2019

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

O.A. No.580 of 2019

in

C.S. No.358 of 2019

Mr.K.Balaji Kumar,
S/o Late B.Krishnamurthy,
having office at No.1, 3rd Street,
Nandanam Extension,
Chennai - 600 035. ... Applicant/Plaintiff

-Versus-

1. M/s.Star Polaris,
Represented by its partner,
V.Mathiyalagan,
No.181/6, MGY Babu Street,
Janaki Nagar, Valasaravakkam,
Chennai - 600 087.
2. M/s.Etcetera Entertainment,
Represented by its Partner,
V.Mathiyalagan,
No.33, Pasumpon Muthuramalingam,
Teynampet, Chennai - 600 018. ... Respondents/Defendants

Original Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to grant an order of Interim Injunction restraining the Respondents/Defendants its agents, servants, assignee from releasing the movie produced by the 1st Defendant titled as "Kolaiyuthir Kalam" pending the suit pending the above application.

This Original Application coming on this day before

this Court for hearing, the Court made the following order:-

The applicant herein is the plaintiff in C.S.No.358 of 2019 and the respondents herein are the defendants thereunder.

2. The applicant/plaintiff filed the Civil Suit under Order IV, Rule 1 of Original Sides rules r/w Order VII Rule 1 of C.P.C., read with Sections 55 and 62 of Copyrights Act, 1957 read with Section 2 (1) (c) (xvii) and 1st proviso to Section 7 of Commercial Division and Commercial Appellate Division of High Courts Act, 2015 praying for the following relief:-

i) Decree of permanent injunction, restraining the defendants, its agents, servants, assignee from releasing the movie produced by the first defendant titled as "Kolaiyuthir Kalam"

and

ii) to pay costs of the suit.

3. Pending disposal of the suit, the applicant/plaintiff filed Original Application No.580 of 2019, for *interim injunction*, restraining the defendants from releasing the aforesaid movie.

4. This Court, by order, dated 11.06.2019, granted an order of *interim injunction* in the said Original Application till 17.06.2019. Now, the applicant/plaintiff has filed rejoinder to the said Application with a prayer to make the interim order absolute.

5. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff prayed for making the interim order absolute, to which, the learned counsel for the defendants raised strong objection by stating that, the second defendant has invested a sum of RS.12,50,00,000/- for the purchase of the movie and since the movie was not released on the date on which, it was slated to be released due to the injunction order of this Court, already the defendants have incurred a loss of Rs.4,00,00,000/-. Thus, by stating so, he prayed for vacating the injunction order.

6. This Court, taking into consideration of the urgency involved in the matter and the merits of the case cannot be decided in one sitting and the same can be decided only after trial, made a suggestion to the learned counsels appearing for the applicant/plaintiff and the respondents/defendants that, if the parties enter into an arrangement among themselves, this Court can consider passing some orders, so that the movie can be released, since the defendants have invested crores and crores for the movie, as noticed above. However, if there is no consensus, then, this Court will consider the merits of the case. The learned counsel for both the parties were agreeable for negotiation and sought for a pass over of the

matter. Accordingly, the matter has been passed over.

7. The learned counsel for both the parties entered into some negotiation outside the Court, however, the same ended in vain and when the matter was taken up at after noon session, both the learned counsels mentioned before this Court to decide the issue on merits. Hence, this Court proceeds to decide/dispose of the Original Application based on its merits.

8. The case of the applicant/plaintiff, in gist and kernel is as follows:-

i) The plaintiff is a Film Director, who directed the Movie, "Vidiyum Mun|". The plaintiff also directed many commercial advertisements in India and America. The plaintiff was inspired by the work of the famous Tamil writer, Mr.S.Rangarajan, who wrote novels in his pen name "Sujatha". The plaintiff was very much impressed with the novel wrote by the said Sujatha, bearing title "Kolaiyuthir Kalam", and was interested in making a film based on the said novel. The Writer died on 27.02.2008. Hence, the plaintiff approached the wife of the said Writer, by name Mrs. Sujatha Rangarajan through his mother, Mrs.Thangam Krishnamurthy and after some negotiation, Mrs. Sujatha Rangarajan agreed to sell the literary work of Kolaiyuthir

Kalam of her husband to the plaintiff. Accordingly, an agreement to sell the literary work, viz., Kolaiyuthir Kalam was entered into between Mrs.Sujatha Rangarajan and Mrs.Thangam Ramamurthy on 01.04.2014.

ii) As per the said agreement, the said Mrs.Thangam Ramamurthy had become the owner of the title, Kolaiyuthir Kalam and Mrs.Thangam Ramamurthy died intestate on 08.05.2018, leaving behind the plaintiff and her daughter, Mrs. Sabitha Vishwanathan. The said Sabitha Vishwanathan has settled in USA and she has no claim over the copyright of the said novel and she has also given no claim letter to the plaintiff to said effect.

iii) During 18th November, 2016, in a Newspaper, "Deccan Chronicle, the plaintiff happened to see that one Mr.Vashu Bhagnani and Mr.Deepshikha Dhiraj Deshmuk were producing a movie titled "Kolaiyuthir Kalaim, starred by Nayanthara. The plaintiff informed the Producers vide notice dated 27.11.2016, and reminder notices in the year 2018 and 2019, stating that he is the owner of the copyright of the said Novel. After the receipt of notice, there were no advertisements in Newspaper about the said Film. The plaintiff was under the bona fide impression that the Producer had dropped the project, and no further action was taken by the plaintiff.

iv) During April, 2019, there was another advertisement in a Tamil Daily, 'Dina Thanthi' indicating that the said movie is in completion stage and will be released by the defendants. The plaintiff was also shocked to see that the defendants had purchased the theatrical right of the movie and the defendants are tentatively going to release the movie in the month of June (this month). The plaintiff issued a legal notice dated 22.04.2019 to the defendants and on receipt of the notice, the defendants did not give any reply disputing the claim of the applicant/plaintiff, and proceeded to release the move on 14.06.2019, which necessitated the plaintiff to file the present Suit for the aforesaid relief.

9. Mr. M.Sriram, the learned counsel appearing for the applicant/plaintiff submitted that the plaintiff is a Film Director, and he being inspired by the work of the writer Mr.S.Rangarajan, thought of making a movie based on the said novel. However, since the said Writer passed away on 27.02.2008, he approached his wife, Mrs. Sujatha Rangaran, through his mother viz., Mrs. Thangam Krishnamurthy and the said Mrs. Sujatha Rangaran agreed to sell the literary work, viz., Kolayuthir Kalam in favour of the plaintiff's mother. Accordingly, agreement was also entered into between the said Mrs. Thangam Krishnamurthy and Mrs.Sujatha

Rangaran on 01.04.2014. and as as per the said agreement, the value of the literary work was narrowed down to Rs.10,00,000/- and out of the said sum, a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- was paid at the time of entering into the agreement and the remaining sum is payable upon commencement of principal photography of the production of the film. The learned counsel submitted that the said agreement has also been marked in the typed-set of papers filed in support of the plaint.

10. Therefore, the learned counsel submitted that, by virtue of the said agreement, the said Mrs.Thangam Ramamurthy had become the absolute owner of the title, Kolaiyuthir Kalam and Mrs.Thangam Ramamurthy died intestate on 08.05.2018, leaving behind the plaintiff and her daughter, Mrs. Sabitha Vishwanathan. The said Sabitha Vishwanathan has settled in USA and she has no claim over the copyright of the said novel and she has also given no claim letter to the plaintiff to said effect and hence, the plaintiff became the absolute owner of the title, Kolayuthir Kalam.

11. The learned counsel further submitted that, the plaintiff on coming to know that one Mr.Vashu Bhagnani and Mr.Deepshikha Dhiraj Deshmuk were producing a movie, bearing the title of the novel wrote by Sujatha, viz.,

"Kolaiyuthir Kalaim, starred by Nayanthara. Immediately thereafter, the plaintiff informed the Producers vide notice dated 27.11.2016, and reminder notices in the year 2018 and 2019, stating that, in terms of the agreement, dated 01.04.2014, he is the owner of the copyright of the said Novel. After the receipt of notice, there were no advertisements in Newspaper about the said Film, however, during April, 2019, there was another advertisement in a Tamil Daily, 'Dina Thanthi' informing that the said movie is in completion stage and will be released by the defendants. The plaintiff was shocked to see that the defendants had purchased the theatrical right of the movie and the defendants are tentatively going to release the movie in the month of June (this month). Hence, the plaintiff issued a legal notice dated 22.04.2019, clearly stating that the plaintiff purchased a few works of a well known Tamil Writer, Sujatha (S.Rangarajan) through an agreement dated 01.04.2014 that includes a novel titled, Kolaiyuthir Kalam, and therefore, the plaintiff is the undisputed present owner of the rights and royalties of the title Kolaiyuthir Kalam, coined by the said Writer and if the defendants proceed to release the movie bearing the title of the said novel, the plaintiff will be constrained to initiate legal action and also sought for revised media publications regarding non-use of the said title. The learned counsel submitted that despite receipt of such

notice, the defendants did not give any reply denying/disputing the claim of the plaintiff and proceeded to make publications about the release of the movie Kolaiyuthir Kalam, the plaintiff filed the suit for the relief of permanent injunction.

12. The learned counsel further submitted that the word 'Kolaiyuthir' was the word coined by the Writer Sujatha, especially, to suit his requirement for the novel, viz. Kolaiyuthir Kalam, which was released in the year 1993 and the said word is not in common parlance and the same can be used only in association with the novel and the plaintiff purchased the copyright over the title Kolaiyuthir Kalam for the purpose of making a movie in that name and his dream of converting the novel into movie would never be fulfilled if the defendants are allowed to release the movie with the impugned title.

13. The learned counsel further contended that though the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court have held in several cases that any title of common name cannot have the copyright, in the present case, the said proposition is not applicable to the present case for the reason that the word, 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam' were the words coined by the Writer in relation to the novel. Further, the present title "Kolaiyuthir Kalam" itself is a literary work of the

author. The learned counsel also contended that only the word, which is in common parlance cannot have the copyright and the names and titles as literary works has the copyright. In support of his contention, he placed reliance on a decision of the Honourable Supreme Court, in the case of **Krishika Lulla and others Vs. Shyam Vithalrao Devkatta and another**, reported in 2016 2 SCC 521, wherein, the Honourable Supreme Court after reference to a passages from Copinger and Skone James on Copyright, 16th Edition by Kevin Garnett, MA, Gillian Davies, D.L. Phd and Gwilyn Harbottle, BA (Oxon) in para No.18, held as follows:-

"18. Names and titles as literary works. In the same vein is the reluctance of English courts to confer copyright protection on titles of newspapers, magazines, books and the like. In relation to books in particular, the title normally forms part of a copyright work consisting of the book as a whole and the issue here may be whether the copying of the title amounts to the taking of a substantial part of the whole work. General statements can nevertheless be found in non-copyright cases to the effect that there is no property in a name or title standing alone unless it is the subject of goodwill or a registered trade mark."

"The courts, have, however, been careful not to rule out the possibility of such protection in appropriate circumstances, although in practice no case has ever gone this far. The only concrete example which has been given judicially is the now archaic practice of the title-page of a book consisting of an extended passage of text." In relation to copyright in characters and titles the learned authors observed:-

"It is very difficult to protect titles of films by an action for infringement of copyright due to the requirements of originality and that a substantial part of a work be copied. If a well-known title of a film is used without authority, the owner's remedy is likely to lie in passing off. Protection by registration as a trade mark may be available provided the title is sufficiently distinctive."

सत्यमेव जयते

14. Thus, by referring to aforesaid decision, the learned counsel contended that only the word, which is in common parlance, cannot be protected under the copyright Act, whereas, the word, which has distinctive meaning and associated with the literary work, can be protected under the Copyright Act and the plaintiff is the copyright owner of the word "Kolaiyuthir Kalam" by virtue of the

cannot claim any right/title over the same. Therefore, the learned counsel prayed for making the interim order absolute.

15. Per contra, Mr.V.Subramanian, the learned counsel for the respondents/defendants contended that the suit itself is not at all maintainable as it lacks cause of action for the reason that it is settled legal position of law that there is no copyright insofar as the title is concerned. In support of such contention, the learned counsel placed reliance on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble First Bench of this Court in the case of **M.s. Lyca Productions Vs. J.Manimaran** and submitted that in the said decision, the First Bench after referring to various decisions, including the American Courts decision, held that the title cannot be protected under the Copyright Act. The learned counsel also drawn this Court's attention to the relevant paras from the decision referred to in the said decision of the Hon'ble First Bench, and the same are extracted hereinbelow:-

- i) **In E.M.Forster v. A.N.Parasuram**, reported in **AIR 1964 Mad 331**, a suit filed by E.M.Forster for alleged infringement of copyright in the title of his book "A Passage to India, the adoption of the title E.M.Forster, A Passage to India, Everyman's Guide" by

the defendants was held not to infringe copyright as there was no copyright in respect of the title. This Court held thus:

" As we have earlier affirmed, there is no copyright in the title and purchasers, whether of the original work or of the guide, are most unlikely to be illiterate, or unacquainted with English. It will be perfectly clear to them, from the words enclosed in brackets as a subtitle, that they were acquiring, not the original work, but a guide for university students."

ii) **In Kanungo Media (P) Limited v. RGV Film Factory, reported in (2007) 1 Del 1122, A.K.Sikri, J, held as under:**

"12. What, therefore, follows is that if a junior user uses the senior user's literary title as the title of a work that by itself does not infringe the copyright of a senior user's work since there is no copyright infringement merely from the identity or similarity of the titles alone."

iii) In **T.Pandiyan Arivali Vs. Kamal Hassan, reported in 1995 (2) LW 347**, a Division Bench of this Court declined to grant injunction sought for by the plaintiff claiming copyright in the title of the book, Magalir Matturm, in Tamil, which he has got registered with the Registrar of Copyright. The Division Bench held :-

" It is generally acknowledged by the Court in India that the definitions in sections 13 and 14 of the copyright act, 1957, do not go beyond the literary work or musical work and the title ordinarily of any such work is not a part of composition or work of the author or the composer. His workmanship is confined to the work and not to the title. It is indeed the law that there is no property in the name which is the term of description used to identify the work and any other person can, with impunity, adopt it. "

16. Thus, by referring to the aforesaid decision, the

learned counsel contended that the title cannot be protected under the Copyright Act. The learned counsel

contended that the first defendant initiated production of the movie with the title, 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam' with stories, screen play, dialogue created by Director, Mr.Chakri Toleti and after having decided to produce the movie with the above title. This movie is an official remake of 2016 American film, Hush. The first defendant filed an application to the Producer's council of Tamil Nadu for the registration of title, 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam' feature's film. Later on, announcement was made in the media in the year 2016 by the first defendant with regard to the production of movie. In the same year, shooting commenced, wherein, Actress Nayanthara along with other actors is in the lead in the movie and the production was given widespread media advertisement in almost all presses in Tamil Nadu. Soon after the completion of the movie, censor certificate was obtained on 16.04.2019 and thereafter, the second respondent obtained entire outright rights for the release of the movie in Tamil Nadu from the first defendant Company.

- 17.** It is his further contention that it is not the case of the plaintiff that the defendants have copied the story from the novel 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam' for their movie, and it is only the case of the plaintiff that, he is the copyright holder of the impugned title, 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam'

Right Act only if any, plot, theme and story of the defendants movie is stolen/copied from the novel wrote by the Sujatha, and there is no semblance of similarity between the story of the novel and the movie and therefore, it is submitted that the claim of the applicant is baseless and it is for some other purpose.

18. Further, the learned counsel contended that, though the plaintiff claims that he with an idea to make an movie based on the said Novel, he has obtained copyright over the impugned title, the plaintiff has to spell out the measures taken for production of the movie in that name and the registration of the title and engagement of actors and director. Admittedly, the plaintiff has not issued any advertisement for the production of the movie based on the novel and in the absence of any such particulars, the plaintiff cannot have a say that his dream of converting the novel into movie would never be fulfilled if the respondents are allowed to release the movie bearing the impugned title.

19. Further, the learned counsel contended that the allegation of the applicant/plaintiff that the respondents never gave response to the legal notice sent by the applicant is utter false. The respondents have inf fact, on receipt of the legal notice, dated 27.11.2016, sent a

reply, via e-mail and even after the receipt of the e-mail, it is the applicant, who has not taken any steps to protect the alleged copyrights he has acquired. Only when the respondents/defendants slated the movie to be released on 14.06.2019, the applicant/plaintiff has come out with the present suit. That would per se prove that the claim of the applicant is not bona fide. Therefore, it is the contention of the learned counsel that, the initiation of the present suit by the plaintiff is nothing but an attempt to black mail the defendants and to extract money from the defendants, and hence, prayed for vacating the interim injunction, as the date of release of the movie has likely been postponed by reason of the interim order. The learned counsel also contended that it is not open to the plaintiff to seek for making the interim order by way of filing rejoinder to the Original Application, as the same would tantamount to decreeing the suit, as the prayer sought for in the suit is afor restraining the defendants from releasing the movie.

- 20.** In view of the submissions made by the learned Counsel for both sides and on going through the averments set out in the plaint, Original Application, Re-joinder and counter affidavit related to the Original Application and documents placed on record, the following point arise for consideration for disposal of the original application

i) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to seek for making the order of interim injunction absolute?

Point

21. As the parties argued on legal points, I am not adverting to the factual aspects of the case. Admittedly, the disputes relates only to the title, Kolaiyuthir Kalam.

To appreciate the contentions of both parties, it is advisable to have a look at Sections 13, 14, and 16 of the Copyrights Act, 1957, which are extracted hereunder:-

Section 13.

Works in which copyright subsists.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this section and the other provisions of this Act, copyright shall subsist throughout India in the following classes of works, that is to say,

- (a) original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic works;
- (b) cinematograph films; and
- (c) sound recording.

(2) Copyright shall not subsist in any work specified in sub-section (1), other than a work to which the provisions of section 40 or section 41 apply, unless,

(i) in the case of a published work, the work is first published in

India, or where the work is first published outside India, the author is at the date of such publication, or in a case where the author was dead at that date, was at the time of his death, a citizen of India;

(ii) in the case of an unpublished work other than a work of architecture, the author is at the date of the making of the work a citizen of India or domiciled in India; and

(iii) in the case of work of architecture, the work is located in India.

Explanation. In the case of a work of joint authorship, the conditions conferring copyright specified in this sub-section shall be satisfied by all the authors of the work.

(3) Copyright shall not subsist

(a) in any cinematograph film if a substantial part of the film is an infringement of the copyright in any other work;

(b) in any sound recording made in respect of a literary, dramatic or musical work, if in making the sound recording, copyright in such work has been infringed.

(4) The copyright in a cinematograph film or a sound recording shall not affect the separate copyright in any work in respect of which or a substantial part of which, the film, or, as the case may be, the sound recording is made.

(5) In the case of work of architecture, copyright shall subsist only in the artistic character and design and shall not extend to processes or methods of construction.

Section 14. Meaning of copyright.-

(1) For the purposes of this Act, copyright means the exclusive right subject to the provisions of this Act,

to do or authorise the doing of any of the following acts in respect of a work or any substantial part thereof, namely:

(a) in the case of a literary, dramatic or musical work, not being a computer programme,

(i) to reproduce the work in any material form including the storing of it in any medium by electronic means;

(ii) to issue copies of the work to the public not being copies already in circulation;

(iii) to perform the work in public, or communicate it to the public;

(iv) to make any cinematograph film or sound recording in respect of the work;

(v) to make any translation of the work;

(vi) to make any adaptation of the work;

(vii) to do, in relation to a translation or an adaptation of the work, any of the acts specified in relation to the work in sub-clauses (i) to (vi);

(b) in the case of a computer programme,

(i) to do any of the acts specified in clause (a);

(ii) to sell or give on commercial rental or offer for sale or for commercial rental any copy of the computer programme:

Provided that such commercial rental does not apply in respect of computer programmes where the programme itself is not the essential object of the rental.

(c) in the case of an artistic work,

(i) to reproduce the work in any material form including (A) the storing of it in any medium by electronic or other means; or (B) depiction in three-

dimensions of a two-dimensional work;
or (C) depiction in two-dimensions of a three-dimensional work;

(ii) to communicate the work to the public;

(iii) to issue copies of the work to the public not being copies already in circulation;

(iv) to include the work in any cinematograph film;

(v) to make any adaptation of the work;

(vi) to do in relation to adaptation of the work any of the acts specified in relation to the work in sub-clauses (i) to (iv);

(d) in the case of a cinematograph film,

(i) to make a copy of the film, including (A) a photograph of any image forming part thereof; or (B) storing of it in any medium by electronic or other means;

(ii) to sell or give on commercial rental or offer for sale or for such rental, any copy of the film;

(iii) to communicate the film to the public;

(e) in the case of a sound recording,

(i) to make any other sound recording embodying it including storing of it in any medium by electronic or other means;

(ii) to sell or give on commercial rental or offer for sale or for such rental, any copy of the sound recording;

(iii) to communicate the sound recording to the public.

Explanation.- For the purposes of this section, a copy which has been sold once shall be deemed to be a copy already in circulation."

No person shall be entitled to copyright or any similar right in any work, whether published or unpublished, otherwise than under and in accordance with the provisions of the said Act or of any other law for the time being in force. But nothing in [Section 16](#) of the Act is to be construed as abrogating any right or jurisdiction to restrain a breach of trust or confidence.

22. A conjoint reading of [Sections 13](#) and [16](#) of the Copyright Act makes it clear that what is protected under the [Copyright Act](#) is the work which is relatable to a cinematograph film, that is to say, the visual recording, including sound recording, produced by process analogous to cinematography. The title, which may be a commonly used word, cannot be protected under the law of copyright. Further, [Section 13](#) also makes it clear that there is no copyright in a title, it is the entire work which is protected by copyright.

23. Further, as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the respondents, it is not claimed by the applicant/plaintiff that the respondents/defendants have copied the plot, story, theme and character of the said novel for their movie, and therefore, they infringed the plaintiff's copyright. The case of the applicant /

plaintiff is that the defendants have copies the title, over which, the plaintiff has vested right, by means of an agreement, dated 01.04.2014.

24. Thus, on a plain reading of Section 13 of the Copyright Act, 1957, copyright subsists in, inter alia, original works including original literary, dramatic and artistic works and cinematograph films. A title is not an original literary work, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Krishika Lulla and others v. Shyam Vithalrao Devkatta and another*, reported in (2016) 2 SCC 521. A title does not qualify for being described as work. It is incomplete in itself and refers to the work that follows. The learned counsel for the applicant placed on reliance on the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Krishika Lulla (supra)*, in support of his contention that protection by registration as a trademark may be available provided title is sufficiently distinctive.

25. In the present case, it is no doubt true that the word, 'Kolaiyuthir Kalam' is not an ordinary word, used in common parlance, but an unique word coined by the Writer, Sujatha for the purpose of the novel and therefore, the said word is sufficiently distinctive and can be used only in association with the novel as the title has nexus with

the story and therefore, it is a literary work of the Writer that can be protected under the Copyright Act.

26. However, it has to be noted that, in the very same judgment, (**viz,, in Krishika Lulla's case,**) the Hon'ble Supreme Court negatived the claim of the plaintiff, who sought for copyright in the title of a literary work by holding that no copyright subsists in the title of a literary work .

27. As stated supra, in view of the settled legal proposition of law by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as the Division Bench of this Court in number of decisions, which was buttressed by the Foreign Courts, that title of common name cannot be protected under the Copyright Act, the applicant/plaintiff cannot as a matter of right seek protection under the Copyright Act for the title, though his claim solely rests upon the fact that the word, Kolaiyuthir is a unique word, coined by the Writer for the purpose of the novel, and therefore, it is literary work, which has nexus with the story and literary work can be protected under the Copy right Act, as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court.

28. For the aforesaid reasons, this Court holds that
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>
 the applicant/plaintiff is not entitled to seek for making

the interim order absolute. Accordingly, Point is answered against the applicant/plaintiff. Hence, order of interim injunction granted in O.A.No.580 of 2019 is vacated and the said application in O.A.No.580 of 2019 is dismissed.

Sd./-K.R.J
28.06.2019

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2019.

JJ 28/06/2019

COURT OFFICER(O.S.)

From 25th day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing certified copies of the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY