



\$~O-29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CS(OS) 513/2024 & I.A. 32155/2024**

MR PAVANJIT KOROTANIAPlaintiff

Through: **Mr. Manoranjan Kumar, Adv.**

versus

MR AMIT JATANADefendant

Through: **None.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **17.11.2025**

1. The plaintiff has filed the instant suit for the following reliefs:

“a) A decree of permanent injunction in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant, his agents, directors, officers, partners, servants, employees, associates, representatives, attorneys, and all others acting for and on his behalf from publishing, writing p speaking, in any media including electronic media, or publishing in any manner or form any content / material which is defamatory about the Plaintiff or publishing or writing any defamatory comment about any proceedings in which the Plaintiff is the party till final disposal of the main suit;

b) A decree directing the Defendant and his agents, directors, officers, partners, servants, employees, associates, representatives, attorneys, and all others acting for and on their behalf to remove the emails which are scurrilous and defamatory against the Plaintiff and tender an apology;

c) An order for damages of Rs 2,50,00,000/- or such further amount as may be ascertained by this Hon'ble Court for defamation and tarnishing the image of the Plaintiff

d) A decree for costs in the proceedings”

2. It appears that the plaintiff is an Administrative Officer serving with the Embassy of the Republic of Croatia since 2003. The plaintiff claims his



long-standing reputation for integrity and professionalism has been gravely tarnished by false, reckless, and defamatory allegations made by the defendant.

3. The plaintiff asserts that the defendant, through an email dated 18.06.2024 addressed to higher authorities in Zagreb and later forwarded to the plaintiff by the Ambassador on 21.06.2024, accused him of running a nexus for bribe-based visa approvals, calling him a criminal, cheater, and unethical, without any evidence.

4. The plaintiff contends that he has no role in visa processing, which is handled solely by Croatian authorities, and that his duties are strictly administrative and carried out under the instructions of the Ambassador. He highlights his clean antecedents and asserts that the defamatory statements have caused severe harm to his reputation, dignity, and standing in society.

5. The plaintiff, therefore, submits that the defendant's allegations are malicious, baseless, and intended to coerce or intimidate the plaintiff and unless restrained by this Court, the defendant is likely to continue such defamatory acts, thereby aggravating the reputational harm.

6. *Vide* order dated 04.07.2024, the Court directed for issuance of summons to the defendant and has considered the submissions made by the plaintiff has also passed the following interim directions:

“None has appeared for the defendant despite service. For today, the defendant had been directed to file written-statement along with the affidavit of admission/denial and reply to the interim application.

However, neither the written-statement has been filed nor any reply has been filed, nor any advance copy has been supplied to learned counsel for the plaintiff.

In these circumstances, the defendant is hereby proceeded against ex parte.

Matter be listed for further proceedings on 15.10.2025.



Interim order, if any, to continue.”

7. The defendant, despite service of the summons, has chosen not to appear. The Court *vide* order dated 14.07.2025 proceeded *ex parte* against the defendant. It is thus seen that there is no written statement or material having been placed on record, despite an opportunity having been granted to rebut the plaint-allegations or to justify the alleged defamatory statements.

8. The impugned e-mail dated 18.06.2024, on its bare perusal, is *ex facie* defamatory, containing unsubstantiated and reckless imputations against the plaintiff. The allegations are *per se* defamatory to the reputation of the plaintiff.

9. Accordingly, the suit stands decreed in terms of Prayer ‘a’ and ‘b’.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff withdraws remaining prayers. Accordingly, the decree is directed to be drawn permanently restraining from making, publishing, circulating, or communicating any defamatory statements or allegations concerning the plaintiff to any third party.

11. Suit stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J
NOVEMBER 17, 2025/P/AMG