HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:62471-DB
CCC No. 1132 of 2026
CNR: KAHC010604492026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE N.V.BHAVANI

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1132 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

DR. B. R. RAVIKANTHEGOWDA
S/O BESAGARAHALLI RAMANNA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
RESIDING AT BILWA NILAYA,
DOOR NO.844/8, 1ST MAIN, 7TH CROSS,
TARALUBALU BADAVANE,
DAVANGERE - 577 005.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. HONNAPPA.S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed by YASHODA K L
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

MR. RAKESH SANJEEVA SHETTY
REPRESENTATIVE POWER T.V.
A NEWS CHANNEL OPERATED BY,
POWER SMART MEDIA PRIVATE LIMITED,
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT 1ST PHASE,
POWER TV NEWS, NO. 7, 11TH MAIN,
MATTIKERE MAIN ROAD, 1ST STAGE,
GOKULA EXTENSION,
YESHWANTPUR, BENGALURU – 560 054.

...ACCUSED

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA AND THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, BY THE COMPLAINANT, WHEREIN PRAYS THAT THE

CNR: KAHC010604492026

HONBLE COURT BE PLEASED TO INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND PUNISH THE ACCUSED FOR BLATANT AND WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 10.07.2026 (ANNEXURE-A) PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL NO.694/2026 (CPC).

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI
AND
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE N.V.BHAVANI

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI)

Heard learned counsel for the complainant.

2. Willful disobedience of the judgment and order dated 10.07.2026 passed by this court in MFA No.694/2026 is alleged. It appears that for violation of an order of temporary injunction, an application moved under Order XXXIX Rule 2A read with Section 151 CPC in Miscellaneous No.102/2023 in O.S.No.1602/2023 was allowed, holding that the appellant therein i.e. Power TV had committed disobedience and breach of the interim order of injunction dated 08.09.2023. The court

had, consequently, directed detention of the appellant in civil prison for a period of three months subject to the plaintiff/respondent depositing subsistence allowance as fixed by the State Government.

3. The aforesaid MFA was dismissed with the following observations/directions:

> ***"ORDER***
>
> *i. The Miscellaneous First Appeal is hereby **dismissed.***
>
> *ii. The finding recorded by the Trial Court in Miscellaneous No.102/2023 holding that the appellant-defendant No.52 had willfully disobeyed and violated the interim order of temporary injunction dated 08.09.2023 passed in O.S.No.1602/2023 is hereby **confirmed.***
>
> *iii. However, having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and in exercise of the discretion vested in this Court, the direction issued by the Trial Court, detaining the appellant in the civil prison for a period of three (3) months is modified to detaining the appellant in civil prison for one(1) day, which is subject to appellant-defendant No.52 shall:*
>
> *a. File an affidavit of undertaking before the Trial Court undertaking that the appellant shall strictly comply with the order of temporary injunction dated 08.09.2023 and shall not telecast or publish any material in violation of the said order.*
>
> *b. Broadcast a statement in its news channel seeking apology about the earlier telecast relating to the respondent expressing regret for the violation of the order of the Court,*

which material shall be placed before the Trial Court.

c. *Clause (a) and (b) to be complied within two weeks from date.*

d. *Pay a cost of ₹50,000/- to the respondent-plaintiff, which shall be deposited before the Trial Court within a period of four (4) weeks from date.*

iv. *In the event of failure to comply with the above directions within the stipulated time, benefit of modified order is not available and the order of the Trial Court directing civil imprisonment shall stand revived and become enforceable.*

v. *The Trial Court shall proceed with the suit expeditiously in accordance with law."*

Now this petition is filed alleging disobedience of the order passed in the MFA.

4. We have perused the elaborate order passed in the MFA and are of the considered opinion that it is a matter where evidence is required to be looked into by the court concerned, which is the Civil Court in this case, to go into the aspect of violation of the order, if any. If the court feels fit, even oral evidence could be led, subject to the independent discretion of the court.

5. It is therefore appropriate to leave it open for the complainant to approach the trial court for moving an application under Order XXXIX Rule 2A CPC, if he is so advised.

6. This contempt petition is therefore consigned.

SD/-
(JAYANT BANERJI)
JUDGE

SD/-
(N.V.BHAVANI)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 7