

CS (COMM.) 206/26

**ANI Media Private Limited Vs. KARUNAVTARAM (YOUTUBE
CHANNEL) AND ANR**

27.04.2026

Present: Sh. Akshit Mago, Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff
(through VC).
Ms. Moomal Joshi, Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff.
Ms. Sugandha Chhibber, Ld. Counsel for the
Defendant No. 2 (through VC).
None for the Defendant No. 1.

Defendant have been served on 14.04.2026.

None has appeared on behalf of the Defendant No. 1
despite service. An affidavit of service is also placed on record.

Plaintiff has submitted that application under Order
XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 may be considered as the defendant have been
served.

On being inquired by the Defendant No. 2 it is
apprised by the Ld. Counsel that the deletion of infringing video as
been submitted by the plaintiff in clause B of the application under
Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 as already been taken down, which is
also confirmed by the Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff that the videos
are still not active.

Defendants are directed to take down these videos till
further orders.

Let the WS, if any, be filed within the statutory period.

On receipt of the WS, plaintiff to file replication, if
any within a period of four weeks.

Be put up for case management hearing and framing
of issues on **23.09.2026**.

Sanjay Khanagwal
District Judge (Commercial Court)-02
Patiala House Court, New Delhi
27.04.2026