



WEB COPY



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

A NO. 4858 of 2025

in CS NO.116 OF 2025

S.Ahmed Meeran

.. Applicant

Vs.

1.Keneeshaa Francis

2.Wow Tamizha

3.Sharmila

4."Bayilvan" Ranganathan

5.Trend Loud Digital India Private Limited,
84/90, InvestWell Center,
Top Floor, Kuppuswamy Street,
Gopathi Narayanaswami Chetty Road,
T.Nagar, Chennai 600 017.

6.Reflect Media Network Private Limited,
29,24, Mettu Street, Sri Shanmuga Nagar,
Madhiravedu, Thiruverkadu,
Chennai 600 077.

7. Che Guevara Jaishankar
Reflect Media Network Private Limited,
29,24, Mettu Street, Sri Shanmuga Nagar,
Madhiravedu, Thiruverkadu,
Chennai 600 077.

.. Respondents



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

PRAYER : This application is filed under Order XIV Rule 8 of O.S.Rules r/w Order 1 Rule 10(2) and Section 151 of C.P.C. to struck off the name of the applicant from the array of parties.

For Applicant : M/s.R.Krishnakumar

For R1 : Mr.Priyan Adarsh
for M/s.C.Santhosh Kumar

For R2 : M/s.R.Adaikala Arokia Raj

For R3 : Mr.T.V.G.Kartheeban

For R4 & R5 : Mr.P.Vasantha Kumar Visweswaran

ORDER

This application has been filed by the applicant/5th defendant to struck off the name of the parties from the array of parties.

2. According to the applicant, he is the 5th defendant in the main suit and is not residing within the jurisdiction of this Court. He is residing at Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar Islands. However, his address has been wrongly mentioned as if he is residing at the 4th defendant address.

Page 2 of 8



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

2.1. The 1st respondent/plaintiff has filed a suit for damages and compensation and also for permanent injunction and mandatory injunction. The 5th defendant is a YouTuber and the 4th defendant is managing and operating the YouTube Channel, and the videos published by the 4th and 5th defendants were alleged against the defendants 4 and 5.

2.2. In fact, the applicant/5th defendant is residing at Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar island and he has never resided or carried on business or personally worked at the address given in the plaint or any other place at Chennai, Tamil Nadu. The applicant and the 4th defendant have entered into a content provider agreement dated 08.04.2025 authorizing him to create content and post the same on his Facebook page under the brand name “Ahmed Meeran” on a profit sharing basis. His place of residence is at Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar Islands as mentioned above. The 4th defendant is neither managing nor operating his YouTube Channel as alleged in Para 11 of the plaint. The suit is mischievously made with malafide intention and ulterior motive, claiming jurisdiction within this Court.

Page 3 of 8



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

2.3. The first respondent /plaintiff is stated to have issued a cease and desist Public notice through her counsel. However, the first respondent filed the present suit. Therefore, there is no jurisdiction to entertain the suit as against the applicant/5th defendant and no leave has been granted by this Court. Hence, the suit is not maintainable against this applicant and the pleadings made against him are also liable to be struck off. Proceeding against the applicant would amount to abuse of process of law. Therefore, the applicant's name is liable to be struck off from the array of parties.

3. The first respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that the affidavit filed by the applicant is false and not maintainable. The applicant falsely claims that he is permanently residing at Andaman and Nicobar Islands. He has also failed to disclose his residence and place of business at Chennai and therefore, the present application is not maintainable.



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

3.1 In the short cause title, his name is mentioned as “Ahmed Meeran”, Trend Loud Digital India Private Limited, 84/90, InvestWell Center, Top Floor Kuppuswamy Street, Gopathi Narayanaswami Chetty Road, T.Nagar, Chennai and in the long cause title also, 5th defendant is a YouTuber and working at 84/90, Invest Center, Top Floor, Kuppusamy Street, GopathiNarayanaswamichetty Road, T.Nagar, Chennai. It is mentioned as YouTuber at the said address and his YouTube page “Ahmed Meeran” is managed and operated by the 5th respondent/4thdefendant. Therefore, there is no material irregularity and the said contention of the applicant deserves no merit.

3.2. The first respondent contends that the applicant has never resided or carried on business at the address given in the plaint is absolutely false. The agreement dated 08.04.2025, entered between the applicant/5th defendant and the 4thdefendant on a profit-sharing basis, clearly shows that the applicant has entered into an agreement at Chennai and therefore, this Court has jurisdiction of this Court at Chennai. As per Clause 14 of the said Agreement, the agreement also provides rights

Page 5 of 8



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

regarding the digital content and its usage. Therefore, the present application is within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court at Chennai. Thus, the present application is without merit. The applicant has admitted the relationship between the 4th defendant and himself regarding digital content. This is a matter to be decided during trial and cannot be dismissed at this stage. Hence, this application is liable to be dismissed.

4. Heard the learned counsel for both sides and also perused the materials available on record.

5. According to the applicant, he is not residing or carrying any business within the jurisdiction of this Court and he has been residing at Port Blair, Andaman and Nicobar Island. The 4th defendant and the applicant entered into an agreement dated 08.04.2025 to create content and post the same on the Facebook page and not on YouTube. Therefore, this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit as no cause of action for the suit.



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. According to the first respondent/plaintiff, the 4th and 5th defendants entered into an agreement and the first defendant is carrying out the business in the address mentioned in the plaint and they also received summons in the said address. Therefore, this is a the matter of trial and at this stage, it cannot be decided.

7. On perusal of the records, it is seen that the address of the applicant /5th defendant mentioned at 84/90, Invest Center, Top Floor, Kuppusamy Street, GopathiNarayanaswamichetty Road, T.Nagar, Chennai. The applicant also appeared before this Court after receipt of the summons at the address mentioned in the plaint. Therefore, though the agreement is in respect of the Facebook page, the defendants have received summons mentioned the address which is within the jurisdiction of this Court. The application was filed on the ground that the defendants are residing outside the jurisdiction of this Court, but in this case, the address has been mentioned within the jurisdiction and the applicant has also received summons. Therefore, at this stage, the prayer cannot be considered and it is matter for trial.



WEB COPY



A.No.4858 of 2025
in C.S.No.116 of 2025

P.DHANABAL, J.

kkd

8. In view of the above, this application stands dismissed. No costs.

08.12.2025

kkd

A NO.4858 of 2025
in
CS NO.116 OF 2025