



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
(ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION)

MONDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2021

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.SESHASAYEE

A.No.1480 of 2021

IN

C.S.No.176 of 2013

M/s.R.S.Infotainment Private Limited,
Represented by its Director
Elred Kumar
No.16, Goodvilla Court,
T.Nagar, Chennai-600 017.

..Plaintiff

Vs

1.M/s.Photon Kathas Production Private Limited,
Represented by its Director
Reshma Ghatala
No.19, Avenue Road,
Ghatala Towers,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600 034.

2.Gautham Vasudev Menon
S/o.Prabha Krishnan
No.205, Lloyds Road,
Royapettah,
Chennai 600 014.

..Defendants

A.No.1480 of 2021:-

Gautham Vasudev Menon
S/o.Prabhakrishnan
No.205, Lloyds Road,
Royapettah,
Chennai 600 014.

..Applicant/2nd Defendant



WEB COPY

2

Vs

M/s.R.S.Infotainment (P) Ltd.,
Represented by its Director,
Elred Kumar
No.16, Goodvill Court,
T.Nagar, Chennai 600 017.

..Respondent/Plaintiff

Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to strike out the name of the 2nd Defendant in the above suit.

This Application coming on this day before this court for hearing, the Court made the following order:

The second defendant has filed this application to drop his name from the list of defendants in the suit.

2. The suit is laid for recovery of a sum of Rs.10,67,11,225/- and the allegation is that the plaintiff and the defendants 1 and 2 have entered into an agreement for production of a movie titled '*Neethane En Ponvasantham*'. The applicant / second defendant herein now alleges that he is only the Director of the movie, and that he has no role other than this vis-a-vis the agreement on the basis of which the suit is laid.



3. Heard both sides. This Court carefully perused the agreement dated 06.07.2011. It is a tri-partite agreement entered into between the plaintiff on the one part and the defendants 1 and 2 on the other part. The agreement discloses that the amount was either paid or promised to be paid by the plaintiff only to the second defendant. Therefore, in the context of the cause of action, it cannot be said that the applicant / second defendant is untouched by it. This therefore, belies the contention of the 2nd defendant, and hence his application lacks merit.

4. In conclusion, this Court finds no merit and accordingly, this application is dismissed.

Sd/-NSSJ
13.09.2021

// Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this day of 2021.

Court Officer(O.S.)

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

Jj 21/09/2021