

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

...Respondent/Defendant

WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 15597 OF 2026

Mr. Karl Tamboly a/w. Mr. Hormuz Mehta, Mr. Ahsan Allana, Mr. Kunal Bilaney
and Mr. Rajvi Shah i/b J. Sagar Associates for the Applicant/Plaintiff.

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.

DATE : 8th MAY, 2026

P.C.

1. A captioned Application has been filed under the provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 2A of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, on account of the repeated and wilful disregard by the Respondent of the Orders passed by this Court.
2. At the outset Mr. Tamboly submits that the Respondent has been served and seeks leave to file an Affidavit of Service.

3. Heard Mr. Tamboly, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Applicant, who has, at the outset, tendered an Affidavit of Service to prove service of the present Interim Application upon the Respondent. The same is taken on record.
4. Mr. Tamboly has then invited my attention to the previous orders passed by this Court, particularly the orders dated 17th April, 2026, and 20th April, 2026, by which this Court had, *inter alia*, ordered and directed as follows:

“8. It is made clear that until the next date of the hearing of this Interim Application, the Defendant shall be restrained from making any statements against the Plaintiff or the Plaintiff's Advocates. It is, however, clarified that if the Defendant has a grievance against the Plaintiff, the Defendant is at liberty to set out what this grievance is and address it only to the appropriate authorities of the Plaintiff.”

5. Mr. Tamboly then pointed out that despite due service of the Order dated 17th April, 2026, the Respondent did not comply with the said Order but has, in fact, continued making per se defamatory statements *inter alia* about the Plaintiff and circulating the same by email from various different email addresses of the Defendant. He has also pointed out that the Respondent had, when served with the Order dated 17th April, 2026, in no uncertain terms, informed the Applicant

that he would neither comply with the orders of this Court nor would he appear before this Court since the Respondent feared for his life.

6. It was in these circumstances that this Court, on 20th April, 2026, had adjourned the matter to 8th May, 2026, and permitted the Respondent to even appear virtually. Despite this, the Respondent did not appear.
7. Mr. Tamboly submitted that what was now most concerning was the fact that not only has the Respondent continued to act in utter disregard and contempt of the orders of this Court, but also has started addressing email communications to various media houses containing per se defamatory statements/material. Mr. Tamboly then submitted that the *modus operandi* adopted by the Respondent is to generate different/new email addresses and, from these addresses, send out emails which contain the per se defamatory statements. Mr. Tamboly has invited my attention to one such email which is dated 24th April, 2026, sent from “pravinkumar.ghodake@gmail.com” to over 600 recipients, which includes various prominent and leading media houses. He points out from the said email some of the statements which are *per se* defamatory :

“c) How IIT Bombay - one of India's most prestigious institutions – is under criminal investigation for destruction of research, criminal conspiracy, forgery, and SC/ST atrocities.

d) How the Supreme Court Registry has been documented as engaging in a 232-day campaign of administrative obstruction-refusing to allot Diary Numbers, purging filings at 1.8 seconds per page, and countermanding the Chief Justice's listing direction”

8. Similarly, from an email dated 6th May, 2026 sent from the email address “Mech&pkumar@yahoo.com” again to several recipients, including media houses, the Respondent has stated as follows:

“27. The Registrar-Criminal Ganesh Bhorkade- is Respondent No. 16 in the same proceedings.

72...A criminal Registrar cannot be trusted with sovereign data. The man who certifies the integrity of IIT Bombay's records is himself a documented fraudster.”

9. Basis the above, Mr. Tamboly has submitted that the Respondent has continued to act in wilful and deliberate disregard of the Orders of this Court. It is in these circumstances that he has today pressed for notice to be issued to the Respondent and also for relief in terms of prayer clause ‘(g)’ since the Respondent has, despite Orders of this Court brazenly continued to use his devices to send out emails and communications which are per se defamatory of the Plaintiff.

10. Having perused the previous orders and the material placed before me, I have no hesitation in accepting the contentions of Mr. Tamboly. Plainly, the Respondent has shown utter disregard for the orders of this Court and has acted in complete and wilful breach thereof. The Respondent even though being permitted to appear virtually, has chosen not to appear, nor has the Respondent engaged an advocate to appear on his behalf. The Respondent has, in fact, in correspondence effectively indicated that he would not comply with the orders of this Court. The Respondent has not only not complied but has now raised the pitch and scale of his vitriol. The Respondent has, in addition to making per se defamatory statements against the Plaintiff, now shown utter and sheer contempt and disregard for orders of this Court. This (mis)conduct on the part of the Respondent cannot and will not be countenanced.

11. As already noted, despite the Court granting the Respondent an opportunity to appear virtually, the Respondent has not done so. Also, despite recording that if the Respondent has any grievance against the Plaintiff it would be open to the Respondent to redress the same by approaching the Plaintiff or in any manner

known to law; the Respondent has done neither of these. To my mind, there can be no justification for the nature of the *per se* defamatory statements that have been made by the Respondent and the conduct of the Respondent, not that the Respondent has even attempted to justify either. In these facts, I am of the strong *prima facie* view that this is a complete malicious vilification campaign against the Applicant, which is an institute of not only national but also international repute. Enough is enough.

12. Hence the following order:

- i. Issue Notice to the Respondent returnable on **17th June, 2026**.
- ii. It is made clear that if, on the next date, the Respondent does not appear before this Court, the Court shall be constrained to ensure the presence of the Respondent by issuing an appropriate warrant.
- iii. For the reasons set out above, the Applicant is granted ad interim relief in terms of prayer clause 'g' of the Interim Application (L) No. 15597 of 2026, which reads thus:

“g. That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to appoint the Court Receiver, High Court, Bombay, or such other fit person as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, with liberty to take assistance of an independent information-technology expert, to identify, inventory, secure, image and preserve the devices, email accounts, cloud storage, messaging accounts and digital repositories used for the impugned communications, including the related drafts, attachments, recipient lists and metadata, and, in the event of non-cooperation or reasonable apprehension of deletion, concealment or further misuse, to take limited custody of such devices for the purpose of preservation and imaging and thereafter deal with the same in accordance with further directions of this Hon'ble Court;”

iv. It is clarified that upon the Receiver complying with prayer clause ‘g’, it shall always be open to the Respondent to make an appropriate application to this Court for the return of the said devices. I am compelled to pass this order given the brazen conduct of the Respondent already noted.

v. The earlier orders shall continue till next date.

13. Mr. Tamboly also prays for, and is granted, liberty to move the Vacation Court in case the Respondent precipitates the matter and does not comply with the orders of this Court.

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]