



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 14TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 21237 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

INTELLIGENT COMMUNITY
MANAGEMENT PVT. LTD.,
A COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER
THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE
AT UTILITY BLOCK, BHARTIYA CITY,
BHARTIYA CENTRE OF
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY,
OPP. THANISANDRA MAIN ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 064.
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR,
MR. PUNSUL VIRMANI,
AGED - MAJOR,
EMAIL-PUNSUL.VIRMANI@ICM.IN

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. PRAVARDHAN URS., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. MS. MONICA PIRGAL,
DAUGHTER OF M. SAMPATHRAJ PIRGAL,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
RESIDING AT OLYMPUS 1-003,
PRESTIGE ACROPOLIS,
ADUGODI MAIN ROAD,
NEXT TO NEXUS MALL, KORAMANGALA,
BENGALURU - 560 029.
EMAIL- MONICASPIRGAL@GMAIL.COM
2. BHARATIYA CONVERGE PRIVATE LIMITED,



A COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER
THE COMPANIES ACT, 2013,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
DISCOVERY CENTRE, BHARTIYA CITY
DEVIN PARADISE ENCLAVE,
N. NAGENAHALLI AKC,
BENGALURU - 560 064.
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR
MR. ARJUN AGGARWAL.

...RESPONDENTS

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE EX-PARTE
AD INTERIM ORDER DATED 04/07/2026 PASSED ON IA NO. 1
IN OS NO.4736 OF 2026 (ANNX-A) AND ITS SUBSEQUENT
EXTENSION ON 09/07/2026. IN THE ALTERNATIVE, DIRECT
THE LEARNED TRIAL COURT TO HEAR THE MATTER ON IA NO.
1 WITHIN 7 DAYS AND PASS NECESSARY ORDERS AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

Aggrieved by the order passed on IA No.1 in
O.S.No.4736/2026 dated 04.07.2026, by the Principal City Civil
and Sessions Judge, Bangalore, the petitioner/defendant is
before this Court

2. Learned Senior Counsel representing the learned
counsel for the petitioner submits that the Trial Court had
granted an ex parte injunction on 04.07.2026. Immediately
after service of notice on the defendant, the defendant filed



objections, and the grievance of the petitioner is that the Trial Court has failed to consider the same so far. It is submitted that the defendant has already filed a caveat, and the Trial Court, without issuing any notice to the petitioner/defendant, granted an *ex parte* injunction.

3. The learned Senior counsel submits that even for seeking dispensation of notice to the respondent, proper reasons have to be given, whereas in this case, there is no such compliance.

4. Considering the fact that despite a caveat being filed, no notice has been served and the objections have already been filed by the petitioner/defendant, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. The trial Court is directed to consider the objections to IA.No.1 within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and to pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.



**NC: 2026:KHC:35678
WP No. 21237 of 2026**

- ii. Notice is not necessary to the respondents in this writ petition.
- iii. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of***.
- iv. Pending I.As if any, in the petition shall stand closed.

**SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE**

MKM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 24