



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 7<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MAY, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K**

**COMMERCIAL APPEAL NO.270 OF 2026**

**BETWEEN:**

M/S SORTING HAT TECHNOLOGIES PRIVATE LIMITED  
A COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER THE  
COMPANIES ACT, 2013 AND HAVING ITS  
REGISTERED OFFICE AT MARUTHI INFOTECH  
CENTRE, 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR, A-BLOCK, DOMLUR,  
KORAMANGALA, INNER RING ROAD,  
BANGALORE 560 071,  
REPRESENTED HEREIN BY ITS AUTHORIZED  
SIGNATORY,  
MR. HARISH SASIKUMAR  
E HARISH.SASIKUMAR@UNACADEMY.COM

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. KASHYAP N. NAIK., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

DR RAKSHITA SINGH  
AGED MAJOR,  
RESIDING AT 4410, DEFENCE COLONY,  
JIND, HARYANA 126 102  
E MAILRAKSHITASINGH@GMAIL.COM

...RESPONDENT





THIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 13(1-A) OF THE COMMERCIAL COURTS ACT, 2015 READ WITH SECTION 37(1)(b) OF THE ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMOPUGNED ORDER DATED 02.05.2026 PASSED BY THE LEARNED LXXXII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE, COMMERCIAL DIVISION (CCH-83) IN COM.A.A. 194/2026 (ANNEXURE-A) AND CONSEQUENTLY, GRANT AN EX PARTE AD-INTERIM ORDER OF TEMPORARY INJUNCTION RESTRAINING THE RESPONDENT FROM MAKING ANY DISPARAGING, DEROGATORY OR DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS AGAINST THE APPELLANT COMPANY OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES ON ANY ONLINE PLATFORMS (SOCIAL MEDIA, YOUTUBE ETC.) IN TERMS OF CLAUSE 10.6 OF THE EDUCATOR AGREEMENT DATED 10.12.2024.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM  
and  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)

This captioned appeal is filed assailing the order dated 02.05.2026 passed by the learned LXXXII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Commercial Division (CCH-83) in Com.A.A.No.194/2026, whereby the matter was reserved for orders on 01.06.2026.



2. The principal grievance urged by the appellant is that, despite having heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length on I.A.No.1, the Commercial Court, instead of pronouncing immediate orders or granting ad-interim protection, proceeded to reserve the matter for orders by assigning a long date, thereby leaving the appellant without any interim safeguard. According to the appellant, once extensive submissions were concluded and the matter stood reserved, the Commercial Court ought to have either granted limited interim protection or pronounced orders within a reasonable time, particularly having regard to the nature of allegations raised in the suit proceedings.

3. It is further contended that subsequent to the order reserving the matter for pronouncement of orders, the respondent has allegedly continued to publish and upload derogatory, defamatory and disparaging material against the appellant-company on various platforms,



thereby causing continuing prejudice to the commercial reputation and business interests of the appellant. Placing reliance on these subsequent developments, the appellant seeks intervention of this Court by way of interim protection pending pronouncement of orders by the Commercial Court on I.A. No.1.

4. Having considered the submissions made and upon perusal of the material placed on record, we are of the considered view that once the Court of first instance has heard the interlocutory application in full and reserved the matter for orders, judicial discipline and propriety would require this Court, while exercising appellate jurisdiction, to refrain from entering into the merits of the very same interlocutory reliefs which are already under active consideration before the Commercial Court. If such parallel consideration is permitted, it would virtually amount to inviting the Appellate Court to adjudicate upon issues that stand reserved for determination before the



Court of first instance, resulting in overlapping consideration and possible inconsistency in judicial orders. The appellant, having invited the Commercial Court to adjudicate upon the prayer for interim relief and having participated in the proceedings culminating in reservation of orders, cannot simultaneously maintain a parallel challenge before this Court seeking substantially identical interim reliefs, more particularly when the Commercial Court is yet to pronounce upon the same. Entertaining such a request at this stage would amount to pre-empting the adjudicatory process already concluded before the Commercial Court and would be contrary to settled principles governing appellate interference in interlocutory matters.

5. Nevertheless, having regard to the apprehension expressed by the appellant concerning continuing prejudice, liberty is reserved to the appellant to mention the matter before the Commercial Court and request for early pronouncement of orders on I.A. No.1. In the event



such a request is made, it is expected that the Commercial Court shall endeavour to pronounce orders as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

Subject to the above observations and liberty, the appeal stands disposed of.

**Sd/-  
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)  
JUDGE**

**Sd/-  
(RAJESH RAI K)  
JUDGE**