

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (C) NO(S). 3071-3072/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 17-10-2025 in WP No. 19135/2022 and order dated 17-10-2025 in WP No. 17726/2022 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

G. KARIAPPA & ETC.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DISCOVERY COMMUNICATIONS INDIA
(PRIVATE COMPANY WITH UNLIMITED LIABILITY)

Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION

IA No. 20484/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 23-01-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Mayank Kshirsagar, AOR
Ms. Pavani Verma, Adv.
Ms. Anumita Verma, Adv.
Mr. Akhikesh Yadav, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Abhinav Mukerji, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Devendra Singh, AOR
Ms. Payal Kakra, Adv.
Mr. Ehraz Zafar, Adv.
Mr. Suraj Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Pranav, Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Singh, Adv.
Ms. Khushdboo Hora, Adv.
Mr. Akash Tyagi, Adv.
Mr. Veerashwar Singh Jadaun, Adv.
Ms. Tanya Gupta, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The petitioner had invoked the writ jurisdiction of the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru against an order of Telecom

Disputes Settlement & Appellate Tribunal (TDSAT), New Delhi dated 01.09.2022 passed in execution proceedings. The High Court disposed of the writ petition by observing that if the petitioner had any grievance, that could have been taken before the High Court within whose jurisdiction the order was passed, that is, the High Court of Delhi. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the view taken by the High Court is not correct as the High Court of Karnataka would have jurisdiction as part of the cause of action had arisen within its territorial limits.

2. Be that as it may, from the records available before us it appears that the entire dispute is with regard to the liability of Directors of a Company in lieu of a decree passed against the Company. It has been brought to our notice that the order which was impugned before the High Court is no longer relevant as by a subsequent order dated 15.12.2025 TDSAT has already issued a notice requiring the Directors to show cause as to why coercive processes may not be issued against them for ensuring execution of the decree against the Company of which they are the Directors. Based on that, the learned counsel for the respondent submits that the issues raised by the petitioner are rendered academic as the petitioner can show cause pursuant to the order dated 15.12.2025.

3. Having regard to the above, we do not deem it necessary to delve into the question sought to be raised by the petitioner. Therefore, while leaving the question of law, if any, open for adjudication in an appropriate case, we dispose of this petition leaving it open to the petitioner to raise his grievances before the TDSAT pursuant to order dated 15.12.2025.

4. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(KAVITA PAHUJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR