

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 13044 OF 2026

IN

SUIT (L) NO. 13041 OF 2026

Indian Institute of Technology Bombay

...Applicant/Plaintiff

Versus

Pravinkumar Ramachandra Ghodake

...Defendant

Mr. Karl Tamboly a/w Mr. Hormus Mehta, Ms. Ahsan Allana and Mr. Kunal Bilaney i/b JSA Advocates, for the Applicant/Plaintiff.

None for the Defendant.

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.

DATE : 20th APRIL, 2026

P.C.

1. Mr. Tamboly, learned counsel for the Applicant/Plaintiff has today brought to my notice the fact that the Defendant has, despite the ad-interim order dated 17th April 2026, continued to address email communications to various persons. He then tenders for the perusal of the Court two email communications addressed by the Defendant, one dated 17th April 2026 and the other dated 18th April 2026 respectively, from which he points out that the Defendant has now also made allegations and *per se* defamatory statements against the Advocates who represent the Plaintiff.

2. Mr. Tamboly points out that the Defendant has in no uncertain terms stated that the Defendant would not comply with the orders of this Court and would not appear before this Court since the Defendant fears for his life. He

then from the email dated 18th April 2026, pointed out that the same concludes as follows:

"46. The Order dated 17 April 2026 was obtained through suppression of material facts and fraud on the Court.

47. My whistleblower communications shall continue. They are protected by the Constitution of India and the Whistleblowers Protection Act, 2014.

48. The suit is a nullity. It does not stand. It will fall.

49. I will not be silenced by a fraudulently obtained order.

50. The matter is entirely sub-judice. Your conduct henceforth has been measured against judicial propriety, not institutional expediency."

3. Mr. Tamboly had, on the previous occasion, pointed out that reference to the proceedings pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court were wholly misplaced, since there was in fact no caveat pending and in any event the Plaintiff had moved this Court after giving notice to the Defendant. He further submitted that even the reference to the writ petition pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court shows from the case status that the same was disposed of before the present suit was filed. Mr. Tamboly therefore reiterated in his submissions that the Defendant was, with impunity, making statements that were false as also *per se* defamatory. He submitted that if, in fact, the Defendant was concerned about the Defendant's safety and life, the Defendant could always appear virtually before this Court. I am in agreement with these submissions.

4. It is made clear that the Defendant may appear on that date virtually if the Defendant so wish to do so. It is again clarified that, in the event the Defendant has any grievance against the Plaintiff, the Defendant is at liberty to espouse the same in an appropriate manner and before the appropriate authorities of the Plaintiff. Furthermore, if the Defendant does have any valid complaint which he

wishes to "expose as a whistleblower" he is also permitted to do so within the mechanisms provided for in the Plaintiff's bylaws.

5. The reply affidavit shall be filed on or before 6th May 2026.
6. Stand over to **8th May 2026** for further hearing of the Interim Application.
7. Ad-interim relief, granted earlier, to continue till the next date.

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]