HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE NO.: C.C. No.5051 of 2026

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
02.	12.10.2026	**MB,J & RY,J** Mr. Sunil B.Ganu, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Rusheek Reddy K.V, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. Dr. Abhishek Manu Sighvi, learned Senior Counsel and Dr. Rishabh Gupta, learned counsel appearing for RAKIA (Online). **I.A.No.1 of 2026** Dispensed with. **C.C. No.5051 of 2026** The petitioner alleges misrepresentation as well as criminal contempt of an order dated 06.08.2026 passed by the learned Commercial Court at Hyderabad in C.E.A.No.155 of 2026 in C.E.P.No.19 of 2023, filed by Ras Al Khaimah Investment Authority ('RAKIA'). By the order dated 06.08.2026, the Commercial Court directed the parties to maintain *status quo* till 12.08.2026, the next date of hearing. On 12.08.2026, the Commercial Court extended the *status quo* order till 18.08.2026. On 18.08.2026, the Commercial Court took on record counter affidavits filed by the respondent Nos.2 and 3 therein. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.1 and 4 to 7 therein sought time for to file their counter affidavits. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant/RAKIA also sought time to obtain instructions on whether to proceed against the respondent Nos.8 to 10 therein. The Commercial Court, accordingly, posted the matter to 27.08.2026. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the interim order of *status quo* dated 06.08.2026 was not extended beyond 18.08.2026. According to Senior Counsel, the	

Advocate appearing for RAKIA issued an Urgent Notice Re Kerala Blasters Football Club ('Legal Notice dated 01.10.2026') to the petitioner and other entities, falsely asserting that the *status quo* order passed by the Commercial Court on 06.08.2026 in C.E.A.Nos.154 and 155 of 2026 continued to remain in force as on 01.10.2026.

The petitioner claims to hold 69.35% of the shares in Magnum Sports Private Limited, which, in turn, holds shares in Kerala Blasters Football Club. In effect, *vide* Legal Notice dated 01.10.2026, RAKIA sought to restrain the petitioner/IQuest Enterprises Private Limited and others from selling Kerala Blasters Football Club, purportedly on the basis of the *status quo* order passed by the Commercial Court.

We have heard Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as learned Senior Counsel and learned counsel representing RAKIA, who sought to interject in the matter.

Senior Counsel appearing for RAKIA submitted that the Supreme Court *vide* order dated 15.10.2025 directed that *status quo* shall be maintained until further orders regarding transfer or creation of any third party rights in respect of assets of the respondent Nos.1 and 2/Companies as well as personal assets of Nimmagadda Prasad and two others.

By an order dated 17.09.2026, the Supreme Court clarified that the interim directions issued during the pendency of the main case would continue to operate till the final directions were complied with.

Although we find substance in the facts placed before this Court by RAKIA, we are also conscious of the fact that RAKIA, as an interjector, does not have a right of audience at this stage of the Contempt

Proceedings.

In this context, reliance is placed on *S.K. Sarkar, Member, Board of Revenue, U.P., Lucknow Vs. Vinay Chandra Misra ((1981) 1 SCC 436),* wherein the Supreme Court observed that Article 215 of The Constitution of India provides that every High Court shall be a Court of Record and shall have all the powers of such a Court including the power to punish for contempt of itself. The Supreme Court clarified that section 15(2) of The Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, does not restrict the power of a High Court to take *suo motu* cognizance of criminal contempt of a subordinate Court and to punish such contempt.

Issue notice, including personal notice, to the respondents/alleged contemnors.

List this matter on 16.11.2026.

We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion on the order dated 15.10.2025 passed by the Supreme Court on whether the said order continued to remain in force as on 01.10.2026, when the Advocate appearing for RAKIA issued the Legal Notice dated 01.10.2026 to the petitioner and other entities. We also note that the petitioner herein was not a party to the order dated 15.10.2025 passed by the Supreme Court.

_____

MB,J

_____

RY,J

Va
