



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**RESERVED ON : 18.11.2025
DELIVERED ON : 27.11.2025**

**CORAM :
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M. JOTHIRAMAN**

**CONTEMPT APPEAL NOS.1 and 2 of 2025
and CMP.Nos.26875, 2725, 2727, 2889 and 2891 of 2025**

Cont.A.No.1 of 2025

Sharada Mylandla

.. Appellant in
Cont.A.No.1 of 2025

Versus

1.PI Opportunities Fund-I,
having its address at #134, Doddakannelli,
next to Wipro Corporate Office, Sarjapur Road,
Bangalore, Karnataka-560 035.
Rep by its authorized signatory
Mr.Vardaan Ahluwalia

2.Nagaraj V.Mylandla

3.Archit V.Mylandla

.. Respondents

Cont.A.No.2 of 2025



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

Nagaraj V.Mylandla

.. Appellant in
Cont.A.No.2 of 2025

WEB COPY

Versus

1.PI Opportunities Fund-I,
having its address at #134, Doddakannelli,
next to Wipro Corporate Office, Sarjapur Road,
Bangalore, Karnataka-560 035.
Rep by its authorized signatory
Mr.Vardaan Ahluwalia

2.Sharada Mylandla

3.Archit V.Mylandla

.. Respondents

Contempt Appeals filed under Section 19 of the Contempt of Courts
Act, 1971 against the order dated 31.01.2025 made in A.No.5208 of 2024 in
Arb.O.P. (Comm.Div.) No.285 of 2024.

For Appellant : Mr.Anirudh Krishnan, in Cont.A.No.1 of 2025

Mr.M.S.Krishnan, Senior Counsel
for Mr.P.Rajkumar Jhabakh in Cont.P.No.2/2025

For Respondents : Mr.Vijay Narayan, Senior Counsel
for Mr.P.Giridharan and
Ms/Shalaka patil and
Ms.Shilpa Sengar
for R1 in Con.A.Nos.1 and 2 of 2025

Mr.Anirudh Krishnan,



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

for R2 in Cont.A.No.2 of 2025

Mr.M.S.Krishnan, Senior Counsel
for Mr.P.Rajkumar Jhabakh for R2 in Cont.P.No.1/2025

COMMON JUDGMENT

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

ContA.No.1 of 2025 has been filed by one Sharadha Mylandla and Cont.A.No.2 of 2025 has been filed by one Nagaraj V. Mylandla, both appeals as against the impugned order dated 31.01.2025 passed in A.No.5208 of 2024 in Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.No.)285 of 2024.

2. The appellant / Sharadha Mylandla is the 3rd respondent and Nagaraj V.Mylandla is the 2nd respondent in Arbitration Original Petition (Com.Div.No.) 285 of 2024. The first respondent PI Opportunities Fund-I represented by its authorised signatory Mr.Vardaan Ahluwalia has filed the said Arb.O.P.(Com.Div.No.) 285 of 2024 on the file of this Court as against these appellants and two others under Sections 47 to 49 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 [in short “Act”] seeking various reliefs. The aforesaid arbitration O.P. has been filed seeking for enforcement of the



foreign final award dated 05.07.2024 made by the Arbitral Tribunal in SIAC Arbitration No.098/2022 in accordance with SIAC Rules. A.Nos.3748 to 3750 and 3752, 3754 of 2024 and O.A.Nos.501 to 503 of 2024 has been filed in the said Arb.O.P. seeking various interim reliefs.

3. Upon hearing either side, a learned Single Judge, vide order dated 25.07.2024 has passed the following order:

(i)

(ii) *Interim injunction restraining the respondents 2 to 3 from, in any manner dealing with, and/or encumbering and/or disposing off, dissipating, and/or creating third party rights and/or alienating any of the movable or immovable properties or assets belonging to respondent Nos.2 to 3 including the properties disclosed in the SASHA. As far as immovable properties are concerned, this interim order is subject to the exclusions as provided under Section 60 of the Civil Procedure Code.*

(iii)

4. The 1st respondent / PI Opportunities Fund-I- the petitioner in arbitration proceedings has filed A.No.5208 of 2024 in Arb.O.P.No.(Comm.Div.No.) 285 of 2024 to hold the respondents guilty of having committed Civil Contempt of this Court by wilfully disobeying the



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

order dated 25.07.2024 in O.A.No.501 of 2024 in O.P.No.285 of 2024 and to punish the respondents with simple imprisonment for a term of 6 months or such period as this Court may deem fit and proper. Upon hearing either side, the Contempt Court, vide order dated 31.01.2025 held that the respondents 1 and 2 therein / appellants herein have committed contempt of Court by their acts of wilful disobedience of not only the orders of this Court dated 25.07.2024 and also subsequent orders dated 22.10.2024 and 29.10.2024 and therefore, exercising power under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, the respondents 1 and 2 therein are liable to be punished. Keeping in mind, the facts and circumstances of the case and also the age of the respondents 1 and 2, and at the same time to uphold the dignity and majesty of the Court, the 1st respondent therein is punished with simple imprisonment for a term of one month and the 2nd respondent is punished with simple imprisonment for a term of 10 days. Aggrieved over the above punishment imposed by the Contempt Court, the present appellants /respondents 1 and 2 therein have preferred the above contempt appeals.



5. Mr.M.S.Krishnan, learned Senior Counsel and Mr.Anirudh

WEB CO

Krishnan, learned counsel appearing for the appellants would submit that the Contempt Court failed to consider that the transfer of 82.5 cents of land situated at No.4, Nellikuppam Village, Thiruporur Taluk, Chengalpattu District was neither intentional nor in deliberate violation of this Court's order. The appellant executed the transfer through Settlement Deed No.16051/2024 as part of a broader family estate planning exercise, without any intent to circumvent the interim order of this Court. Upon realising the implications of the transfer and well before the contempt applications was brought before the Contempt Court, the appellant took immediate action to reverse the transaction. The re-transfer of the property was effectuated through Settlement Deed 20888/2024, executed on 28.09.2024, demonstrating the Appellant's bonafide intent to comply with the Court's order. In the disclosure affidavit and accompanying typed set of documents, the appellants produced a duly registered Gift Deed dated 21.12.2023 (bearing Doc.No.16550 of 2023), which clearly demonstrates that the flat is owned by her daughter, who currently resides in the United States of America and not by the appellant, Sharadha Mylandla. The appellant



voluntarily undertook to disclose a complete list of her assets on 22.10.2024 and was granted one week time to submit the details, including both immovable and movable assets. Given the varied nature of movable assets, certain inadvertent errors occurred in the initial disclosure. However, these were not intentional omissions, and the appellant promptly rectified them by filing supplementary affidavits on 11.11.2024 and 22.11.2024. These corrections were made on the appellant's own initiative, not due to my identification by PIOF. The Contempt Court failed to note that non-compliance was neither wilful nor wanton and were by no means intended to come in the way of proper administration of justice.

6. *Per contra*, Mr.Vijay Narayan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that despite the order dated 25.07.2024, the appellants were in breach of this Court's order by way of gifting to their son / 3rd respondent therein transferring the property admeasuring 0.45 acres of agricultural land in Thiruporur, Chengalpattu District. Further, even in December 2023, a settlement deed was executed by the mother / Sharadha Mylandla in favour of her son and the said transfer is also fraudulent and



voidable at the instance of the applicant. The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that the Contempt Court also passed subsequent orders pursuant to the interim injunction granted on 25.07.2024, especially the order dated 22.10.2024, in and by which the Contempt Court directed the respondents 1 and 2 therein to disclose all their assets including the properties which were alienated / transferred from the date of award i.e., 05.07.2024, including particulars of movable and immovable properties along with details of the bank accounts on or before 29.10.2024. Subsequently, by order dated 29.10.2024, this Court recorded the affidavits of disclosure of assets by respondents 1 and 2 and also directed them to file supplementary affidavits. Subsequently, on 11.11.2024, this Court noticing that the 1st respondent / one of the appellant has stated that details of the assets have been disclosed to the best of their ability and that details of any movable properties that have been inadvertently missed and later comes to attention would be disclosed by way of supplementary affidavit.

7. It is seen from the records that the contempt petition emanating from the alleged violation of the interim order dated 25.07.2024 passed in



favour of PI Opportunities Fund -I restraining the appellants from dealing with their movable and immovable properties. According to the appellants, the transactions in question were neither wilful nor disobedience of any Court Order and part of property estate were inadvertently executed. It is the specific case of the appellants that upon realization of the implications of the order of this Court i.e., well before contempt proceedings were served on them.

8. In view of the above circumstances, this Court is of the view that the appellants have taken immediate steps to reverse the transactions upon realising the Court's order well before the contempt proceedings were served on them. The above act of the appellants would show that they made a genuine attempt on their part to protect themselves of contempt. In such circumstances, imposing the punishment to the appellants by awarding punishment with simple imprisonment for a term of one month to the first appellant and punishing the second appellant with simple imprisonment for a term of 10 days in respect of the appellants is unwarranted and as such the same is liable to be set aside.



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and in order to meet the ends of justice, this Court modifies the punishment imposed on the appellants to the effect that each of the appellants shall pay Rs.2,000/- as fine to the respondents, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

10. These Contempt Appeals are partly allowed and the impugned order dated 31.01.2025 made in A.No.5208 of 2024 in Arb.O.P. (Comm.Div.) No.285 of 2024 is modified to the above extent. Consequently, connected civil miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

(N.S.K., J.) (M.J.R., J.)
27.11.2025

Jvm
Internet : Yes
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No



WEB COPY



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

N. SATHISH KUMAR, J.
and
M. JOTHIRAMAN, J.

Jvm



WEB COPY



Cont.A.Nos.1 & 2 of 2025

Common Judgment in
CONTEMPT APPEAL NOS.1 and 2 of 2025

27.11.2025