

**IN THE COURT OF V ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND
SESSIONS JUDGE AT BENGALURU**

Dated this the 6th day of March 2026

Present : **SRI.VEDAMOORTHY B.S.**, B.A.(L.), LL.B.,
XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-14)
C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-13)

O.S.No.3934/2022

PLAINTIFF : Smt.Latha Raghavan.

V/s

DEFENDANTS : Smt.C.V.Sreelatha & another.

i.	Provision under which the application is filed	Order VII Rule 11(a) and (c) R/w Section 151 of the Code of the Civil Procedure.
ii.	Relief sought for	To reject the plaint
iii.	The date on which the application is filed	18.04.2024
iv.	Number of the application	I.A.No.II
v.	The date on which the objections are filed by different opponents	12.06.2024
vi.	The date on which the orders were passed on the said application	06.03.2026

ORDERS ON I.A.No.II

The defendants have filed I.A.No.II under Order VII Rule 11(a) and (c) R/w Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure seeking an order to reject the plaint.

2. In support of the I.A.No.II, the 1st defendant has filed her affidavit. The grounds urged for rejection of the plaint are that it does not disclose the correct cause of action. The plaintiff has suppressed the material facts. The suit value is not properly assessed for payment of Court Fees. The claim of the plaintiff is unfair and unreasonable. It is illegal. The suit is barred by any other law.

3. The plaintiff has filed objections to I.A.No.II denying the entire affidavit averments filed in support of I.A.No.II. Her contentions are that the defendants filed this application in order to defame the reputation of the plaintiff and spread the rumors in the society in respect of the character of the plaintiff and her family members. The plaintiff suffered physically and mentally a lot and damaged her status in the

society. It lead to mental pressure on the plaintiff and she underwent mental agony and serious health issues. The plaintiff issued Legal Notices to the defendants not to interrupt the plaintiff's peaceful life by spreading false and bad roomers in the society. The defendants filed this application to drag on the proceedings. Hence, prayed to dismiss I.A.No.II.

4. Heard the arguments of the learned Counsel for the defendants on I.A.No.II. The learned Counsel for the plaintiff has filed written arguments on I.A.No.II. Perused the materials available on record.

6. The following point that has been arisen for my consideration:

Whether the plaint is liable to be rejected under Order VII Rule 11(a) and (c) of the Code of Civil Procedure ? If so, what order ?

7. My answer to the above point is in the Negative for the following:

REASONS

8. It is well settled principles of law that while considering the application under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the Court shall considered only the plaint averments, suit documents referred in the plaint and not the defences of the defendants. In the said background, I read the pleadings of the plaintiff averred in the plaint.

9. This suit is filed by the plaintiff against the defendants for two reliefs. They are as follows:-

- a. To award a sum of Rs.25.00 lakhs towards the damages for defaming the image, reputation of the plaintiff in the society by spreading false allegations against the plaintiff and stopped the marriage of her daughter.
- b. Permanent injunction against the defendants, their men either directly or indirectly or acting in any manner or interfering with the peaceful living of the plaintiff including negatively spreading rumors, sarcastically subjecting the plaintiff or her family members or their concerns to any character assassinations/ serious allegations or defamation.

10. As per the plaint averments, the plaintiff and the defendants are known to each other from long back and they were neighboring friends when the plaintiff was residing at Malleshwaram, Bengaluru. The plaintiff is the housewife, her husband is running LVR Pest Control Services. The plaintiff has a good name and fame in the society. She recognized all over in her family, outside family and friends with due respect. The 2nd defendant is the daughter of the 1st defendant. The defendants are architect and interior designers at Malleshwaram and Commercial Street at Bengaluru. The husband of the 1st defendant by name Sathish I. is running a transport and construction business. The defendants are living separately from Sathish I. Due to the adamant and arrogant nature of the 1st defendant, her husband felt suffocation in his own house. The defendants cultivated luxuries life in his absence. They were leading luxuries life in all indecent manner in the name of social living, social culture by wearing western dresses, drinking by attending the parties and coming back to home late night.

They neglected the husband of the 1st defendant. By threatening him, they grabbed his properties and took his mobile to their custody. The 1st defendant did not discharge her duty as dutiful wife under Hindu Marriage Act. She neglected her husband for her lavish life. She is greedy of money as she is having huge minister's kind of network around her. She was targeting the plaintiff along with her husband who is sharing his pain and personal feelings in friendship way. The defendants were tapping and tracing the activities of Sathish I. by using illegal sources. They made him as negligible and they were least bothered him in their life.

11. What made the plaintiff to file the present suit is that the defendants were unnecessarily interfering with the personal life of the plaintiff by making false and serious allegations by misunderstanding the friendship between the plaintiff Sathish I. They were suspecting their friendship and creating illicit relationship between them. They cultivated inimical mind towards the plaintiff and Sathish I. It was

spoiled the reputation of the plaintiff in her public life. The false and serious allegations made by the defendants tarnished the hard earned image of the plaintiff and it caused a breach of peace in the vicinity. It developed hate-redness over the plaintiff in the eye of general public, her relatives, neighbors, friends and caused huge damage to her. After the defendants started to interfere with the family matters of the plaintiff, her husband wished to talk with Sathish I. At that time, the defendants became furious and started to abuse the husband of the plaintiff in vulgar language. They tried to spoil the name, fame and reputation of the plaintiff by spreading rumors about her by defaming her family members. On 10.06.2022, the plaintiff arranged the marriage of her daughter Varshini Raghawan at Gangamma Thimmaiah inn and Convention Center, Bengaluru. All marriage arrangements, purchase and printing of the wedding cards were made by the plaintiff to the said marriage to perform in a decent manner. At that time, the defendants out of jealous and vengeance have made false allegations against the

plaintiff and her daughter. They informed the bridegroom Nagamahendra that the plaintiff has got illicit relationship with the husband of the 1st defendant. As a result of the same, the marriage of the daughter of the plaintiff was stopped. All the marriage arrangements made by the plaintiff become waste. Thereby, the plaintiff sustained monetary loss. Apart from it, the family of the plaintiff lost respect and dignity before her relatives, friends and neighbors. She is feeling shy to show her face before them. The defendants have no manner of right to interfere with the family affairs of the plaintiff. The defendants are trying to spoil the reputation of the plaintiff by tapping the information and threatening the family of the plaintiff. On 05.05.2022, the plaintiff issued Legal Notice to the defendants calling upon them not to interfere with her life and not to spoil reputation of her family members. On 08.05.2022 at 5:00 p.m., the defendants gave a complaint before Malleshwaram Police Station against Porter Delivery boy for delivering the notice sent by the plaintiff. In that regard, FIR in Crime No.67/2022 was registered against

the Counsel of the plaintiff and Porter Delivery boy for the offence punishable under Section 448 of the Indian Penal Code. The notice issued through post was duly served on the defendants. On 09.05.2022, the defendants issued Legal Notice instead of reply to the notice of the plaintiff by making false stories and serious allegations against the plaintiff. It shows that the defendants are purposefully making false allegations against the plaintiff. The criminal case was registered in Crime No.69/2022 based on the complaint given by the plaintiff against the defendants. In the said Crime, the defendants gave their confession letters. On 20.05.2022, the plaintiff issued reply to the notice of the defendants denying their false allegations.

12. The cause of action is a bundle of facts which contains the right of the plaintiff to seek the relief and to lead the plaintiff to seek such relief against the defendants. Every person as his own dignity and respect in the Society. No person has any right to damage the said dignity and respect of any other person. If a person defames the other, the person

defamed has a right to seek damages for such defamation and also preventive measures to make further defamation. In the present case on hand, the suit of the plaintiff is in the said form which contains the allegations of defamation by the defendants against the plaintiff and the damages caused to the plaintiff due to the said act of defamation of the defendants. Since, the allegations of the defamation by the defendants against the plaintiff are continuous in nature, the plaintiff has also sought for the relief of permanent injunction. These are the cause of action pleaded by the plaintiff in the plaint to file the present suit. Therefore, it cannot say that the plaint averments does not disclose cause of action and the plaint is liable to be rejected under Order VII Rule 11(a) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

13. The plaintiff has valued the suit by filing a valuation slip. The methods adopt to arrive at the valuation as per the said valuation slip are under Section 21 of the Karnataka Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act for the relief of damages and Section 26(c) of the Karnataka Court Fees and Suits

Valuation Act. For the relief of damages, the plaintiff has paid the Court fee of Rs.1,29,625/- and for the relief of permanent injunction, the plaintiff has paid the Court fee of Rs.25/-. It appears that the said valuation made by the plaintiff and the Court fee paid thereon in accordance with the provisions of the Karnataka Court Fees and Suits Valuation Act. For the above reasons, the plaint cannot be rejected under Order VII Rule 11(c) of the Code of Civil Procedure.

14. In I.A.No.II and the affidavit filed in support of I.A.No.II, the defendants have not stated that under which law, this suit is barred. On careful reading of the plaint averments and the relief prayed therein, it appears that this suit is not barred under any law for the time being in force. For the above reasons, the plaint is not liable to be rejected under Order VII Rule 11(a) and (c) of the Code of Civil Procedure. Hence, I answer the above point in the Negative. In the result, I proceed to pass the following :

ORDERS

I.A.No.II filed by the defendants under Order VII Rule 11(a) and (c) R/w Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure is hereby dismissed.

No orders as to cost.

(Typed by the stenographer in the Court computer on my direct dictation, printout taken, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court today on this the 6th day of March 2026).

(VEDAMOORTHY B.S.)

XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.

C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.