



WEB COPY



A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.11.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

Galatta Voice (You Tube Channel)

... Applicant / 2nd Defendant.

vs.

1.M. Raghul S/o. Munusamy

... 1st Respondent / Plaintiff

2. Vimalleswaran

Secretary of Chennai Press Club

Government Estate, Mount Road,

Chepauk, Triplicane, Chennai-2.

... 2nd Respondent / 1st Defendant

3. NewsGlitz (You Tube Channel),

Vanse Infotech Private Ltd Building,

Old No.72, New No.2,

Venkata Rathnam Nagar Extension,

Teachers' Colony, Adyar, Chennai-20. ... 3rd Respondent / 3rd Defendant

PRAYER: Application filed under Order XIV, Rule 8 of Original Side Rules

Page No.1 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

read with Order VII Rule 11(a) of Civil Procedure Code praying to reject the

Plaint as against the applicant / 2nd defendant in C.S. No.207 of 2024.

For Applicant : Mr. Sanjay Pinto

For Respondents :

R1 : Mr. V.G. Vivek

R2 : Mr. K. Gokul Ram

R3 : Mr K. Ramkumar

ORDER

This application has been filed by the petitioner to reject the Plaint as against the applicant / 2nd defendant in the main Suit in C.S. No.207 of 2024.

2. The averments of the application are as follows:

The applicant is the 2nd defendant in the main Suit and the 1st respondent / Plaintiff has filed the main Suit for damages alleging 'defamation' through a video interview with the 1st defendant, uploaded on

Page No.2 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

08.08.2024 on a You Tube Views Channel namely 'Galatta Voice', named as

WEB COPY

the 2nd defendant, owned by the applicant / 2nd defendant's company -

Galatta Media Private Limited claiming damages to the tune of

Rs.1,00,00,000/- from the three defendants. In fact, the applicant / 2nd

defendant is not a juristic entity. Already it is owned by Galatta Media Pvt.

Ltd., one of the largest digital media companies in India. The 1st defendant

Mr. Vimalleswaran, General Secretary of Chennai Press Club and

Investigative Journalist. The 3rd defendant is News Glitz, an another You

Tube Channel. The Plaintiff is stated to be a 'practising Advocate', Social

Activist, Politician and President of the Tamil Nadu Youth Congress for North

Chennai. A video interview with an External Panelist, the 1st defendant,

about investigation in the murder of Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) Leader Mr.

Armstrong was uploaded in the applicant / 2nd defendant's You Tube Channel

'Galatta Voice' on 08.08.2024. In the said interview, there were two

references to a person called "Raghul" and "North Chennai". Now the

Page No.3 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

Plaintiff claims that in the interview, the 1st defendant was talking about him on the applicant /2nd defendant's You Tube Channel and the remarks were defamatory that "there is one person between Ashwathaman and Nagendran. They are looking for a Lawyer in Trichy and another is Raghul who is in North Chennai".

2.1. The Plaintiff had sent a Legal Notice dated 10.08.2024 to the applicant /2nd defendant among others and the applicant / 2nd defendant was unaware of 'who the Plaintiff was' and did not upload any content about the Plaintiff. Therefore, the question of defaming the Plaintiff does not arise. Moreover, reference to "Raghul" in "North Chennai" by the 1st defendant / interviewee on the applicant / 2nd defendant's You Tube Channel, which was deleted by the applicant / 2nd defendant. There is absolutely no cause of action in the Plaint as far as the applicant / 2nd defendant is concerned. There is nothing in the Plaint to show that the applicant / 2nd defendant had

Page No.4 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

uploaded any content about the Plaintiff. There is no any material to show the Plaintiff's reputation and how it was allegedly damaged by the mere mention of "Raghul" and "North Chennai". Therefore there is no cause of action for the Suit and the applicant / 2nd defendant is not a necessary party. The Plaint has to be rejected for mis-joinder of parties. Without any cause of action, the Suit has been filed as against this 2nd defendant. Therefore, the Suit is liable to be rejected.

3. The 1st respondent / Plaintiff has filed a counter stating that the application filed by the applicant is not maintainable and he was set exparte in the main Suit and thereafter, he filed an application to set aside the order along with the Written statement and the same was allowed. The defendants in the interview, used the Plaintiff's name and that the Plaintiff is from North Madras, the Plaintiff is the friend of Aswathaman S/o. Nagadhiran, both are living in the same locality at Sathiyamoorthy Nagar, Vyasarpadi and both are

Page No.5 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

friends from childhood, in the North Madras all people know that Raghul is the friend of one Aswathaman, the Plaintiff is an Advocate and moved a Parole petition for Nagadhiran in W.P. No.22892 of 2023 dated 01.08.2023, in the interview, the 1st defendant had talked about sensitive issue of Mr. Armstrong's murder case. The 1st defendant, in the interview, very clearly pointed out that Raghul, the Plaintiff herein, was a friend of Aswathaman. Based on the same, the 1st respondent was summoned by the Special Investigation Team in the murder case of BSP Leader Mr. Armstrong for more than four times, because of the interview given by the 1st defendant and uploaded by the 2nd defendant. Therefore, the Plaintiff filed the Suit and there is a cause of action for the Suit. As far as the misjoinder is concerned, it is to be tested through trial and since the 1st defendant's video was uploaded in the 2nd defendant's You Tube Channel, the applicant / 2nd defendant is also a necessary party and therefore, the Suit cannot be rejected as against the applicant / 2nd defendant partly.

Page No.6 of 12



WEB COPY



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

4. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant / 2nd defendant would submit that the 1st defendant uploaded a video in the 2nd defendant's You Tube Channel. According to the respondent / Plaintiff, those contents are defamatory. There is no any defamatory contents in the name of Plaintiff and they referred only "Raghul" and "North Chennai". It does not mean that it identified, only the Plaintiff. There is no cause of action for the Suit. Mere reference to the words "Raghul" and "North Chennai" alone does not create any cause of action for filing the Suit. Therefore, the Suit is liable to be rejected. Moreover, even if any video uploaded, he is not liable and he has not uploaded any video and therefore, he is an unnecessary party and therefore, the Suit is liable to be rejected.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent / Plaintiff would submit the 1st defendant in the interview defamed the Plaintiff and

Page No.7 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

used the words "Raghul" and "North Chennai" and "friend of Aswathaman".

The Plaintiff is well known to the North Madras people with the name of Raghul, friend of Aswathaman and he also filed a Writ petition for the parole of said Aswathaman as an Advocate. Based on the interview, the Special Investigation Team have frequently summoned the 1st respondent / Plaintiff for the Armstrong murder case and for the investigation purpose, because of the defamatory contents uploaded in the YouTube Channel. Therefore, the Plaintiff filed the Suit and there is cause of action for the Suit and there are pleadings in respect of the cause of action. Therefore, this application is liable to be dismissed.

6. Heard both sides and perused the entire materials.

7. The 1st respondent / Plaintiff has filed a Suit for damages for



A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

defamatory contents uploaded in the YouTube channel. The 1st defendant uploaded the defamatory video in the 2nd and 3rd defendants' YouTube channel. Therefore, the Plaintiff filed the Suit. According to the 1st defendant, he has not uploaded any defamatory contents and he is only a platform 'intermediary' and he has not involved in any uploading of defamatory videos and thereby, there is no cause of action arose against him. Even as per the Complaint averments, the words used are "Raghul" and "North Chennai" and those said words do not mean the Plaintiff. Therefore, there is no cause of action for the Suit.

8. This Court also perused the entire materials. According to the Plaintiff, he is a famous figure in the North Madras in his name 'Raghul' and he, being an Advocate, appeared for his friend Aswathaman in a Writ petition before the High Court and the interview was pertaining to a murder case of Mr. Armstrong, where the name of the Plaintiff Raghul along with the said

Page No.9 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025

in

C.S. No.207 of 2024

Aswathaman have been referred. The North Chennai people very well know about Raghul, as a friend of Aswathaman. Therefore, based on the said video, the Special Investigation Team also investigated the Plaintiff frequently. Therefore, he filed a Suit.

9. As per the Plaint averments, there is a cause of action pleaded and the cause of action arose within the jurisdiction of this Court and whether the Suit cause of action is true or not has to be decided through trial. At this juncture, in this case, the genuinity of the cause of action cannot be decided. Already the Plaintiff pleaded the cause of action and that is sufficient to maintain the Suit. The genuinity of the cause of action can be decided through trial. Moreover it is well settled law that the Plaint cannot be rejected in a partial manner as against the applicant / 2nd defendant.

10. As far as the mis-joinder is concerned, it is the matter of trial. It is one of the defenses to be taken by the applicant / 2nd defendant. The Plaint discloses the cause of action and thereby, this application has no merits and

Page No.10 of 12



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

deserves to be dismissed.

11. As far as the defamatory words are concerned, whether the above said interview is identifying the Plaintiff or not is a matter of trial. Therefore, at this stage, the Plaint cannot be rejected and the application is liable to be dismissed.

12. Accordingly, this application is *dismissed*.

07.11.2025
[2/2]

mjs

P.DHANABAL.,J

mjs



WEB COPY



A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

A. No.4641 of 2025
in
C.S. No.207 of 2024

07.11.2025
[2/2]