

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU**  
**APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

Srinivas S. Devathi, 63, 11<sup>th</sup> B Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560079, INDIA

Mobile. 91 - 9663932293

E-mail ID. ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com

.... Appellant and Party-in-Person

**AND:**

Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs,

Legal and Treaties Division, Ph:91-11-24674144.

Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also  
representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.

.... Respondent

**INDEX**

| Sl. No. | Description  | Pages    | C.F.<br>Paid |
|---------|--|----------|--------------|
| 1       | Application for restoration of Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, arising from Honorable court orders for Writ Petition WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, and facts.     | 1 to 7   |              |
| 2       | Annexure A1 - The certified true copy of the Honorable court orders issued for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024. Also attached as annexure B with WA 886/2025. | 8 to 26  |              |
| 3       | Annexure A2 - A copy of 'Memo filed under order XXVII rule 6 of CPC', filed with the Honorable court on 11-6-2025, for WA 886/2025.                          | 27 to 32 |              |
| 4       | Annexure A3 - Online High Court of Karnataka website print out of the case status for WA 886/2025, showing the court directions, posting the WA for orders.  | 33 to 42 |              |

|   |   |       |  |
|---|---|-------|--|
| 5 | Annexure A4 - Online High Court of Karnataka website print out of the case status for WA 886/2025, showing the daily orders.  | 43,44 |  |
| 6 | For annexure S, two bottles of pepsi 750 ml, tagged with WA number WA 886/2025. I will leave them in the custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC. |       |  |
| 7 | For annexure T, two lenovo laptops, tagged with WA number WA 886/2025. I will leave them in the custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC.          |       |  |
| 8 | For annexure T, two lenovo laptop charging cords. I will leave them in the custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC.                               |       |  |
| 9 | Verifying Affidavit   | 45,46 |  |

Bengaluru

Date: 7/8/2025

APPELLANT

Party in Person



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU  
APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

**Srinivas S. Devathi,  
Aged 48 years,  
S/o Late D. Satyanarayana,  
Residing at No.63, 11th 'B' Cross,  
3rd Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560 079,  
INDIA.  
Mobile. 91 - 9663932293  
E-mail ID. ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com  
.... Appellant and Party-in-Person**

**AND:**

**Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs,  
Legal and Treaties Division,  
Room# 901, Akbar Bhavan,  
Chanakyapuri,  
New Delhi-110 021.  
Ph:91-11-24674143.  
Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also  
representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.  
.... Respondent**

**APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION OF WRIT APPEAL WA 886/2025,  
ARISING FROM HONORABLE COURT ORDERS FOR WRIT PETITION  
WP 12356/2023, DATED 14-6-2024, AND FACTS.**

1. I request the Honorable court to post this Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, for granting orders, arising from the 'Honorable court orders issued for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, attached as annexure A1 with this application, with a divisional bench for 'Intellectual Property Rights, IPR' classification that is other than the bench that issued orders for WA 983/2024, and a bench in



which the single Judge that issued impugned orders for WP 13823/2023 is not part of. The Honorable court orders for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024 are also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025.

2. On 4-8-2025, this Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 was posted for orders with the same bench that issued orders for a preceeding Writ Appeal WA 983/2024, wherein WA 983/2024 was disposed, dismissed for non compliance of office objections. The conflict of overriding their own earlier orders, resulted in this Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 also marked dismissed as not maintainable. Hence I request that this Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 be restored, and listed for granting orders with a bench other than the bench that issued orders for WA 983/2024, and a bench in which the single Judge that issued impugned orders for WP 13823/2023 is not part of.

3. I also include the following annexures with this application. A copy of memo filed with the Honorable court under order XXVII rule 6 of CPC, filed on 11-6-2025, is attached as annexure A2. Online High Court of Karnataka website print out of the case status for WA 886/2025, showing the court directions, posting the WA for orders, is attached as annexure A3. Online High Court of Karnataka website print out of the case status for WA 886/2025, showing the daily orders, is attached as annexure A4.

4. I request the Honorable court, to post this WA 886/2025 for orders, arising from the attached annexure A1, 'Honorable court orders issued for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025', and grant orders for

- Annexure A2, the 'Memo filed under order XXVII rule 6 of CPC, filed with the Honorable court on 11-6-2025' with the earliest possible hearing date, for hearing from Mrs. Uma Sekhar, and
- The Interim prayer orders P through DD, which include the investigation prayer points and security prayer points. This will ensure the negative tactics of US PTO and their allies are immediately arrested and terminated, so that we can move into the stage of execution of 62 sale agreements.





5. Upon hearing from Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary of Legal and Treaties Division, Ministry of External Affairs, on the set posted hearing date, and receipt of the 'Consent letter', I request the Honorable court to grant orders for prayer point O, so that I can initiate the 'Original Suit' proceeding at the earliest.

6. I present the following facts with this Application.

- The application is arising from the attached Annexure A1, the Honorable court issued orders for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025.
- The 'Memo filed under order XXVII rule 6 of CPC, filed with the Honorable court on 11-6-2025', attached annexure A2, is arising from the Honorable court orders issued for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, attached annexure A1, also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025. It is well over 7 months past the due date set by the Honorable court in the orders, attached annexure A1, and I have not received the 'Consent letter' from the respondent yet.
- The interim prayer points P through DD, are also arising from the attached annexure A1, the Honorable court orders issued for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, and annexures F, G, H, J, R, S, and T attached with Writ Appeal WA 886/2025. Only by conducting all these investigations immediately, we will neutralize all the negative tactics, and move forward into the stage of execution of 62 sale agreements.

7. With reference to annexure S of the WA 886/2025, I am in possession of the two pepsi beverage bottles, 750 ml, since I have not received directions from the Honorable court about where, and to whom I should I hand them over. I confirmed that the Honorable court filing counter does not take tagged food, beverage samples. With reference to annexure T of the WA 886/2025, I am in possession of the two lenovo laptops, two chargings cords, since I have not received directions from the Honorable court about where, and to whom I should I hand them over. I confirmed that the



Honorable court filing counter does not take tagged laptops. Knowing that we do not possess the advanced technology labs and facilities to evaluate and report usage of 'serum technology counter molecules', and evaluate and report usage of 'imposing external cage' using laptops at operating system level, I have made efforts to hand them over to the Honorable court, for ensuring that there are no pending Writ appeal WA 886/2025 related submissions from my side. With reference to these pepsi beverage bottles, and laptops, I refer the Honorable court to prayer point CC, by way of which I will build the necessary technology, by organizing the 'Special Technology Unit'. These could be evaluated there, within a few months after the 'Unit' is organized.

8. With reference to the two bottles of pepsi 750 ml, contaminated with serum technology counter molecules, with reference to annexure S, I did bring them up to the notice of the Honorable Justices and did not receive instructions. If Honorable court directs me to hand them over to the respondent, I will hand them over to Mrs. Uma Sekhar, on the hearing date scheduled to hear from her. Mutatis mutandis, with reference to annexure T, for two lenovo laptops along with their charging cords. I will mention and leave them in custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC.

9. The 17 office objections listed here, raised in WA 983/2024 were complied with, and this Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 was filed by me on 2-6-2025.

1. JURISDICTION TO BE STATED CORRECTLY AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

2. PROVISION OF LAW TO BE STATED CORRECTLY AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

3. WRIT APPEAL PRAYER TO BE SETTING ASIDE WP ORDER ONLY

4. INDEX OF EACH VOLUMES TO BE PRODUCED IN 1ST SET OF WRIT APPEAL

5. WP COPY TO BE STITCHED IMMEDIATELY AFTER WP IMPUGNED ORDER



6.ADDRESS OF THE RESPONDENTS AND APPELLANTS AND AGGRIEVED PARA TO BE STATED AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

7.LIST OF AUTHORITIES TO BE STATED AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

8.WP IMPUGNED ORDER NOT TO BE MARKED AS ANNEXURES-A AND B TO BE REMOVED AND ANNEXURE NOT TO BE STATED AT WRIT APPEAL VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT TO BE REMOVED

9.INSTEAD OF MEMO, IA FOR ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED

10. ORIGINAL OR AUTHENTIC WP COPY AND ITS AFFIDAVIT TO BE PRODUCED

11. PARTY-IN-PERSON TO BE SIGNED EACH VOLUME OF INDEX

12. INTERIM PRAYER PARA TO BE REMOVED IN BOTH SETS OF WRIT APPEAL

13. ANNEXURE MARKING NOT TO BE MADE AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM AND WRIT APPEAL AFFIDAVIT TO BE REMOVED

14. PAGE No. 50 TO 68 IN 1ST SET OF WRIT APPEAL TO BE CLARIFIED

15. WRIT APPEAL PAPERS TO BE PAGINATED PROPERLY, ACCORDINGLY INDEX TO BE RECTIFIED

16. DESCRIPTION OF ALL ANNEXURES NOT FORTHCOMING TO WP MEMORANDUM TO BE CLARIFIED

17. ANNEXURES-A TO J REPEATED IN 1ST VOLUME OF WRIT APPEAL TO BE REMOVED


10. Form C is issued by the Party in person committee for WA 886/2025 on 12-6-2025. With the detailed legal write up, citing all applicable articles of 'constitution of India', all applicable CPC sections, and crpc sections, explicitly listed and detailed in the 'GROUNDS' section of the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, by each prayer point, my capability for representing myself in front of the Honorable court was very clearly established and the Form C was issued on 12-6-2025. I also indicate my thorough understanding of Patent Cooperation Treaty, a legal agreement binding 158 World



countries, and cite all the applicable articles and provisions of the PCT preamble very clearly in the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025.

11. URGENCY for receiving the orders. Honorable court issued orders for WP 12356/2023, on 14-6-2024, attached annexure A1, also attached as annexure B with the Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, directing respondent to issue the 'Consent letter' that would address CPC section 86(1), so that I could initiate the 'Original Suit' against United States Patent and Trademark Office, US PTO. These orders are based on facts and documented evidence recognized by the Honorable court. The due date set in these orders for respondent to issue the 'Consent letter' was 14-12-2024. It is well over seven months past the due date and counting. I have not received the 'Consent letter' from the respondent yet. Hence there is urgency to hear from Mrs. Uma Sekhar, who is the person able to answer questions relating to suit.

12. While the attacks by way of Internal cage, brain cage, external cage, and life cage are at the indicated 4%, reported in annexures S, and T, they still exist. Hence, there is urgency to conduct all the necessary investigations and neutralize all the negative tactics used by US PTO and their allies, my public enemies listed in annexure F of the WA 886/2025. Further, with reference of annexures G, H, J, R, S, and T of WA 886/2025, there is urgency to immediately conduct all investigations by granting orders for prayer points P through DD. The breach of Patent Cooperation Treaty committed by US PTO, recognized by the Honorable court is dated 5-8-2015. Hence there is urgency to initiate the Original Suit against them, subsequent to which the orders for the execution of 62 sale agreements could be granted, orders for prayer points A through N, after other required legal criterion are met. I will provide status to the Honorable court on adjourned dates after Original suit orders ensure US PTO fraud elimination.



13. Respondent have no objections for this Writ Appeal. Given this, I request the Honorable court grant the requested orders, pronounce orders immediately. With this restoration application for WA 886/2025, I affirmatively indicate to the Honorable court that



WA 983/2024 could be permanently marked disposed and dismissed. I state this fact to indicate that there is only one Writ Appeal filed by me active, pending in this Honorable court and no duplicates.

14. With these facts I request Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 be restored, posted for granting orders with Divisional bench, for IPR classification, that is other than the bench that issued orders for WA 983/2024, and bench in which the single Judge that issued impugned orders for WP 13823/2023 is not part of. The Writ Appeal WA 886/2025 must be posted for granting orders at the earliest possible date, and granted orders immediately.



Bengaluru

Date:

7/8/2025

APPELLANT

Party in Person



- 1 -

NC: 2024:KHC:21418  
WP No. 12356 of 2023

— 8 —

26067/25  
Sri Nivasa S Devathi  
Annexure A1 - Page 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 14<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2024

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C M JOSHI

WRIT PETITION NO. 12356 OF 2023 (GM-RES)

**BETWEEN:**

SRINIVAS S. DEVATHI,  
S/O LATE D. SATYANARAYANA,  
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,  
R/AT NO.63, 11<sup>TH</sup> 'B' CROSS, 3<sup>RD</sup> MAIN,  
PRASHANTH NAGAR, BANGALORE-560 079,  
INDIA.  
MOBILE (91)-966-393-2293  
EMAIL ID- projectearthling@srinivasdevathi.com

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI SRINIVAS S DEVATHI, PARTY -IN -PERSON)

**AND:**

UNION OF INDIA,  
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,  
LEGAL AND TREATIES DIVISION,  
ROOM #901, AKBAR BHAVAN,  
CHANAKYAPURI, NEW DELHI-110 021.  
PH: 91-11-24674143.  
REP. BY MRS. UMA SEKHAR, ADDL. SECRETARY,  
ALSO REPRESENTING EXTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER,  
MR. S. JAISHANKAR.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI M.N KUMAR, CGSPC)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226  
AND 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, BY PETITIONER PARTY-  
IN- PERSON PRAYING TO ISSUE ORDERS TO RESPONDENT TO  
ISSUE THE CONSENT LETTER OF INDIAN CENTRAL



This Certified copy contains..... 19 pages  
And Copying charges with of ₹.. 87  
Received





GOVERNMENT DULY CERTIFIED BY SECRETARY TO INDIAN CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, TO SUE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE, USPTO, AND SUMMON WIPO, WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION, INTERNATIONAL BUREAU TO ASSIST THE COURT WITH DISCOVERY AND FACT FINDING TO ADDRESS CPC SECTION 86(1) APPLICABLE TO THEM, SUCH THAT I COULD INITIATE THE COURT PROCEEDING IN THE TRIAL COURT, AT THE EARLIEST. THIS IS AN ACCORDANCE WITH DOCUMENTED PROOF SUBMITTED AND EXPLAINED IN ANNEXURE A, OF BREACH OF PATENT COOPERATION TREATY ARTICLES 18(2) AND 19(1), COMMITTED BY USPTO ON 05/08/2015 IN THEIR CAPACITY OF ISA, INTERNATIONAL SEARCH AUTHORITY FOR MY PCT INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PCT/US2014/046619 WHICH CORRESPONDS TO MY INVENTION PRIORITY PATENT GRANT US 8,910,998 BI.

THIS WRIT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 07-06-2024 COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF ORDERS THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

In this petition, petitioner-party in -person has prayed for the following relief:

"To issue orders to respondent to issue the 'consent letter of Indian Central Government duly certified by Secretary to Indian Central Government, to sue United States Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO, and summon WIPO, World Intellectual Property Organization, International Bureau to assist the court with discovery and fact finding', to address CPC Section 86(1) applicable to them, such that I could initiate






the court proceeding in the trial court, at the earliest. This is in accordance with documented proof submitted and explained in Annexure- A, of 'Breach of Patent Co-operation Treaty Articles 18(2) and 19(1), committed by USPTO on 05/08/2015 in their capacity of ISA, International Search Authority for my PCT International Application PCT/US2014/046619 which corresponds to my invention priority patent grant US 8,910,998 BI."

2. The arguments by the writ petitioner-party-in-person and Sri M.N. Kumar, the learned CGSPC for respondent-Union of India were heard.

3. The petitioner party-in-person states that he applied for Priority Patent with US Patent Office with Patent No. 8910998 B1 for 'Systems and methods for altering the colour, appearance or feel of a vehicle surface' claiming that he had invented the same. He also filed an application under the Patent Co-operation Treaty, International Application No.PCT/US/2014/046619 dated 15-07-2014 to the USPTO in the capacity of "International







Search Authority- ISA". USPTO issued a fabricated "International Search Report- ISR" and it was transmitted to the petitioner on 05-08-2015 thereby breaching Articles 18(2) and 19(1) of Patent Co-operation Treaty. Using the said PCT International Application, he filed 15 National and 02 Regional Stage applications for Patent Protection of his invention covering total of 61 Non USA Countries. It is alleged by the petitioner that the fabricated ISR with fabricated Prior art has resulted in all National and Regional Stage applications to go into 'pending-reject' office actions causing him to lose his 'patent rights' across 60 World Countries. Therefore, it was alleged that the fraud committed by USPTO is very deliberate and intentional with malicious intent and motive to block his invention patent rights from across the World Countries.

4. Therefore, he filed a suit in OS No.2613/2020 but the said suit came to be rejected on the ground that the defendant is an instrumentality of the Foreign State and the consent of the Central Government under Section





NC: 2024:KHC:21418  
WP No. 12356 of 2023

86 of CPC is mandatory. Therefore, he sought for consent of the Central Government and when there was no response, he approached this Court in W.P.No.21782/2022 and the said petition came to be disposed of on 06-02-2023 with a direction to the respondent-Central Government to consider and pass appropriate orders with regard to the grievance of the petitioner. It is submitted that there was Webex meeting with the petitioner on 13-2-2023 and thereafter, the respondent by an email communication dated 05-04-2023, informed that it is not possible to accede to the request.

5. The petitioner submits that he has submitted voluminous materials to the respondent with all documents which show that the ISR issued by USPTO was fabricated and malicious and none of the materials submitted by him were considered by the respondent. It is submitted that a two line communication is issued as per Annexure-C which reads as below:







"The request has been considered in the Ministry of External Affairs. However, it has not been found possible to accede to the request."

6. The petitioner submits that the Article 18 of the Patent Co-operation Treaty stipulates that the ISR shall as soon as it is established have to be transmitted to the applicant. But such communication was delayed by the USPTO, which is the ISA.

7. In order to substantiate his contentions, he has produced voluminous material to demonstrate that he has merits in suing the US PTO and the WIPO. It is submitted that Annexure-C issued by respondent is a non speaking order and the reasons for rejection of his application is not forthcoming and therefore, Annexure-C has to be quashed and the respondent be directed to issue the consent as required under Section 86 of Code of Civil Procedure.

8. Learned standing counsel appearing for the respondent-Union of India submits that the request of the





NC: 2024:KHC:21418  
WP No. 12356 of 2023

petitioner was considered by the Central Government in length and it was found that there was no merit in the claim. It is submitted that the functioning of ISA is governed by the agreement of the respective authority with the international bureau of WIPO. The application filed by the petitioner with the USPTO is in the capacity of ISA and therefore, the USPTO is not sued in the capacity of an instrumentality of the State. It is submitted that the respondent is not having competency to make assessment or give comment as to whether or not USPTO can be sued by the plaintiff or not. Therefore, he defended the communication issued by the respondent as per Annexure - C.

9. It is relevant to note that this Court in W.P.No.21782/2022 had directed the respondent to consider the grievance of the petitioner and pass necessary orders. Para 7 of the order passed by this Court dated 06-02-2023 reads as below:

"The submission is placed on record. Since the consideration is underway, I deem it appropriate to







issue a direction to the respondent to pass appropriate orders, with regard to the grievance of the petitioner, after affording an opportunity of hearing, within six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, if not earlier."

10. Pursuant to the said orders passed by this Court, a Webex Meeting was held by the respondent with the petitioner on 13-02-2023 and a communication was issued as per Annexure C on 05-04-2023 as stated supra.

11. The provisions of Section 86 of Code of Civil Procedure deal with consent to be given by the Central Government to sue any Foreign State, its Envoys, Rulers etc. When a request is made to the Central Government by a person who is aggrieved by the act of any Foreign Entity which is under the control of the Foreign State, the consent of the Central Government is mandatory. Such consent, if rejected would affect the rights of an Indian citizen. A rejection cannot be by cryptic and whimsical orders. In this regard, it is relevant to rely on the






NC: 2024:KHC:21418  
WP No. 12356 of 2023

judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Veb Deutfracht Seereederei Rostock v. New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd.**,<sup>1</sup>

- "11. Sub-section (2) of Section 86 of the Code says that such consent shall not be given unless it appears to the Central Government that the suit in question has been filed under the conditions mentioned in clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (2) of Section 86. Clause (b) of sub-section (2) provides that consent shall be given, in respect of a suit, which has been filed against a foreign State, if such foreign State 'by itself or another, trades within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court'. When sub-section (2) provides that such consent shall be given by the Central Government in respect of cases covered by clause (b) of sub-section (2), then a person who is to sue in any court of competent jurisdiction, against any such foreign State or any company or corporation, which can be held to be a foreign State in respect of any breach of contract, is entitled to apply for consent of the Central Government and the Central Government is expected to consider the said request taking into consideration the facts and

<sup>1</sup> (1994) 1 SCC 282







circumstances of that particular case. While considering the question of grant or refusal of such consent, the Central Government is expected to examine that question objectively. Once the Central Government is satisfied that a cause of action has accrued to the applicant against any foreign company or corporation, which shall be deemed to be a foreign State, such consent should be given. The immunity and protection extended to the foreign State on the basis of International Law should not be stretched to a limit, so that a foreign company and corporation, trading within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the court concerned, may take a plea of Section 86, although prima facie it appears that such company or corporation is liable to be sued for any act or omission on their part or for any breach of the terms of the contract entered on their behalf. It is neither the purpose nor the scope of Section 86 to protect such foreign traders, who have committed breach of the terms of the contract, causing loss and injury to the plaintiff. But, if it appears to the Central Government that, any attempt on the part of the plaintiff, to sue a foreign State, including any company or corporation, is just to harass





NC: 2024:KHC:21418  
WP No. 12356 of 2023

or to drag them in a frivolous litigation, then certainly the Central Government shall be justified in rejecting any such application for consent, because such motivated action on the part of the plaintiff, may strain the relations of this country with the foreign State.

Further in another judgment in the case of **Harbhajan Singh Dhalla v. Union of India**,<sup>2</sup> the Apex Court has held as below:

"23. It is well to bear in mind the two principles on which sovereign immunity rest. The principle expressed in maxim *par in parem non habet jurisdictionem* is concerned with the status of equality. The other principle on which immunity is based is that of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states. See in this connection *Brownlie "Principles of Public International Law*, 3rd Edn., pp. 322-25. Much has happened in different States since Marshall, C.J. of the United States in *Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon* [(1812) 7 Cranch 116 : Green, p. 237; Briggs, p. 413 Bishop, p. 659] explained the principle and said that a state within its own territory as being "necessarily exclusive and absolute". In the days of international trade and

<sup>2</sup> (1986) 4 SCC 678







commerce, international interdependence and international opening of embassies, in granting sanction the growth of a national law in this aspect has to be borne in mind. The interpretation of the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure must be in consonance with the basic principles of the Indian Constitution.

24. The expression "political ground" used in the communication of the Government noted before covers a wide range as explained in Aiyar's *Law Lexicon*, p. 986. It connotes without further particulars vague and fanciful attitude.

25. *Corpus Juris Secundum*, Vol. 48, p. 28 at p. 30 to 35 deals with the various kinds of remedies by a citizen against foreign State. In granting of sanction or refusing sanction under Section 86, the Central Government must bear these factors in mind.

26. In this case there is no provision of any appeal from the order of the Central Government in either granting or refusing to grant sanction under Section 86 of the Code. This sanction or lack of sanction may, however, be questioned in the appropriate proceedings in court but inasmuch as there is no provision of appeal, it is necessary that there should be an objective evaluation and examination by the appropriate authority of relevant and material factors in exercising its






jurisdiction under Section 86 by the Central Government. There is an implicit requirement of observance of the principles of natural justice and also the implicit requirement that the decision must be expressed in such a manner that reasons can be spelt out from such decision. Though this is an administrative order in a case of this nature, there should be reasons. If the administrative authorities are enjoined to decide the rights of the parties, it is essential that such administrative authority should accord fair and proper hearing to the person to be affected by the order and give sufficiently clear and explicit reasons. Such reasons must be on relevant material factors objectively considered. There is no claim of any privilege that disclosure of reasons would undermine the political or national interest of the country."

So also, in the case of ***Shanti Prasad Agarwalla v. Union of India***<sup>3</sup>, the Apex Court has noted the necessity of a reasoned order in following words:

"6. In the present case also, it is difficult to comprehend what is meant by the expression "political grounds" used in the impugned order. It is not clear what political considerations necessitated

<sup>3</sup> 1991 Supp (2) SCC 296







the rejection of the application. The Central Government while considering the application under Section 86 of the Code must decide the application in accordance with the provisions of the section itself and state clearly and intelligibly its reasons for rejecting the application. In the instant case, we are unable to appreciate what political considerations weighed with the Central Government for rejecting the application. We, therefore, have no alternative but to quash the impugned Order No. 10245-EE/82 dated February 1, 1984 and remit the matter to the Central Government for taking a fresh decision in accordance with law after giving an opportunity to the petitioners of being heard."

12. Thus, it is evident that the rejection has to be with reasons. A cryptic and two line order would not show that there was any application of mind by the concerned authority. The applicant, who is an Indian citizen is entitled to know the reasons, unless they affect the National interest. Annexure-C issued by the respondent does not disclose any such reason for rejection.





13. Pursuant to a query posed by this Court dated 03-01-2024, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent-Union of India, has filed a Memo stating that the place of cause of action being USA, the petitioner should have filed the suit in USA. Such a view was taken by the Additional City Civil Judge Bangalore in OS No.2613/2020 filed by the plaintiff which came to be rejected. It was stated in the memo that the subject matter is not about the infringement of the patent rights of the patent holder, but it was the allegation pertaining to ISA report issued by USPTO in the capacity of ISA. Therefore, he has defended the Annexure-C issued by respondent. Evidently, the above contentions of the respondent-Union of India are not sustainable. The petitioner is not claiming that his patent rights have been infringed. It is his contention that his patent applications for the invention made by him are being rejected on the basis of a fabricated and fraudulent search report by the ISA. It is his contention that the voluminous materials








produced by him show that with a malicious intention that the petitioner, who is an Indian should not be allowed to obtain the patent, a fabricated ISA report came to be communicated to him. The delay in communicating the ISR itself is an indication of the violation of the Articles of the Treaty. Evidently, the respondent-Union of India, should have bestowed its attention on these contentions of the petitioner.

14. Now the next question would be, Whether a direction can be issued to the respondent-Union of India, to give consent as required under Section 86 of CPC? In this regard, it is relevant to refer to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India v. Bilash Chand Jain***<sup>4</sup>, wherein it was held below:

"5. It may be mentioned that there is a distinction between "judicial review" and "appellate jurisdiction". The High Court in a writ petition when examining an administrative order is not exercising the appellate power but exercising the power of

(2009) 16 SCC 601





judicial review which is much narrower than the appellate power. Such judicial review can only be exercised on Wednesbury principles.

6. It is well settled by a series of decisions of this Court that the High Court cannot itself perform the functions of a statutory authority. Thus in *G. Veerappa Pillai v. Raman and Raman Ltd.* [(1952) 1 SCC 334 : AIR 1952 SC 192] it was held that the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot direct the Regional Transport Authority to grant bus permits as the grant of the permit is entirely within the discretion of the Regional Transport Authority. Of course, if the Regional Transport Authority rejects the application for grant of permits arbitrarily or illegally, the High Court can set aside the order of the Regional Transport Authority and direct the Regional Transport Authority to pass a fresh order in accordance with law, but the High Court cannot itself order grant of permits, in that case it will be taking over the function of the Regional Transport Authority.

11. In the circumstances, we allow these appeals; set aside the judgments of the Division Bench and the learned Single Judge of the High Court and remand the matter to the Central Government to reconsider the prayer of Respondent 1 under Section 86(3) CPC for giving consent to execute the








decree in accordance with law expeditiously. There shall be no order as to costs."

15. Therefore, this Court cannot take the role of the respondent and issue directions to give consent. It is the duty of the respondent-Union of India to consider the grievance of the petitioner and pass a reasoned order as reiterated by the Apex Court in several decisions as referred above. A cryptic order, without any reasons is not expected by the Union of India, when a citizen of this Country claims an invention, which would have fetched him a patent of great importance.

16. For aforesaid reasons, the writ petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the following:

ORDER

- (i) Writ Petition is allowed.
- (ii) The communication dated 05-04-2023 at Annexure-C is hereby set aside.
- (iii) The respondent-Union of India, is directed to reconsider the application of the petitioner afresh





and pass a reasoned order, by following the principles of natural justice, as observed by the Apex Court in the above referred judgments within a period of six months.

Sd/-  
JUDGE

tsn\*

List No.: 1 SI No.: 3

TRUE COPY

*[Signature]*  
Section Officer  
High Court of Karnataka  
Bengaluru - 560 001

16/6/25

This is the Annexure A1 stated in the  
Affidavit of SRINIVAS S. DEVATHI

*[Signature]*  
M. S. BALLAL  
Advocate & Notary (Govt. Of India)  
Bengaluru, Reg. No. 2374, Expiry dt. 30.03.2028.



- The date on which the application made 13/6/24
- b) The date on which charges and additional Charges if any are called for 16/6/24
- c) The date on which charges and additional Charges if any are deposited/Paid 16/6/24
- d) The date on which the copy is ready 16/6/24
- e) The date of notifying that the copy is ready For delivery 16/6/24
- f) The date on which the applicant is required to appear on or before 19/6/24
- g) The date on which the copy is delivered to the Applicant 17/6/25
- Examined by 17/6/25



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU**  
**APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

Srinivas S. Devathi, 63, 11<sup>th</sup> B Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560079, INDIA

Mobile. 91 - 9663932293

E-mail ID. ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com

.... Appellant and Party-in-Person

**AND:**

Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs,

Legal and Treaties Division, Ph:91-11-24674144.

Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also  
representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.

.... Respondent

**INDEX**

| Sl. No. | Description                           | Pages  | C.F.<br>Paid |
|---------|---------------------------------------|--------|--------------|
| 1       | Memo under order XXVII, rule 6 of CPC | 1 to 4 |              |
| 2       | Verifying Affidavit                   | 5      |              |

Bengaluru

Date: 10/6/2025

APPELLANT

Party in Person

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU  
APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

**Srinivas S. Devathi,  
Aged 48 years,  
S/o Late D. Satyanarayana,  
Residing at No.63, 11th 'B' Cross,  
3rd Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560 079,  
INDIA.  
Mobile. 91 - 9663932293  
E-mail ID. ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com  
.... Appellant and Party-in-Person**

**AND:**

**Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs,  
Legal and Treaties Division,  
Room# 901, Akbar Bhavan,  
Chanakyapuri,  
New Delhi-110 021.  
Ph:91-11-24674143.  
Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also  
representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.  
.... Respondent**

**MEMO UNDER ORDER XXVII, RULE 6 OF CPC**

I request the Honorable court to issue orders, for the '*attendance of person able to answer questions relating to suit*', which is the Respondent, Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary of Legal and Treaties Division, Ministry of External Affairs, Union of India, to provide '*answer about the 'Consent letter'*' that was due for issue by 14-12-2024, according to the Honorable court orders dated 14-6-2024, for WP 12356/2023, and list this Writ Appeal in this honorable



court, IPR classification, for hearing with Mrs. Uma Sekhar, and issuing orders granting 'Interim relief'.

For 'Interim prayer point 'O'', I request the orders indicate that Mrs. Uma Sekhar carry the 'high value transformative document, Consent letter' by hand, and hand deliver to me, in the Honorable court, so that I initiate the 'Original Suit' immediately, without losing time.

- I request the Honorable court to indicate that Mrs. Uma Sekhar plan for attending few court hearings, and plan her stay in Bengaluru for at least one week, for accomplishing the following legal objectives according to the court orders.
- I request that Mrs. Uma Sekhar plan on attending the court hearings continuously in that week, and with reference to the 'granted Interim relief orders', and the 'URGENCY indicated in the Writ Appeal', I must get Mrs. Uma Sekhar, '*person able to answer questions relating to suit*', to provide her answers and remarks for each of the Prayer points, starting with 'Interim prayer points' P-DD, and 'Prayer points' A-N.

| Prayer in this Writ Appeal | Granting 'Interim orders' court gives 'action' due dates for | URGENCY and 'PRIORITY of action' indicated with 'Very high', and 'High'. | Questions and discussion subjects that must be talked through.   |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| P                          | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months   | Very high  | 12 member unit, 6 member technical team. For starting interrogation and investigation. Identification of unit members. When and who would introduce the unit to me in the court. |
| Q                          | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months   | High   | Data security and continuation of work.  |

|  |                      |           |   |
|--|----------------------|-----------|---|
| R  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | High      | Investigate at the earliest.  |
| S  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | High      | Investigate at the earliest.  |
| T  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | High      | Investigate at the earliest.  |
| U  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | High      | Investigate at the earliest.  |
| V  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | High      | Investigate at the earliest.  |
| W  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Eliminate forgery and shred forged documents immediately.   |
| X  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Connected to W  |
| Y  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Connected to W, X   |
| Z  | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Aggravating 'external cage' must be investigated and terminated.  |
| AA   | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Connected to Z  |
| BB   | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Connected to Z, AA  |
| CC   | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Must immediately take action, and build 'Technology competence', organize STUN immediately.                             |
| DD   | 3, 4, 5, or 6 months | Very high | Your valuation is of great importance, with real data from 61 countries. Talk through option of polls at WIPO assembly. |
| Prayer orders issued after 'Project Earthling©' goes live with decisive majority vote, and on the following adjourned date. Projected events would include organizing EC, appointing its designated signatory team, organizing ITB Bank India, and opening my individual bank account at ITB Bank India. |                      |           |   |



|             |  |  |   |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| A through N |  | High. For concluding the cause of action | Must talk through the list of prayers points.   |
| G           |  | High                                     | One of the banks organized would be ITB Bank INDIA. My individual bank account would be opened.         |
| J           |  | High                                     | IEC, will be organized. Formal introduction.  |
| K           |  | High                                     | NWB must be passed. Formal introduction.  |
| N           |  | High                                     | Death trap on school and college students must end. Subject introduced and brought for decisive voting. |

- In these court hearings, within the legal framework, to accomplish the legal resolution, an interactive, open dialogue environment might be allowed by the Honorable court, to ensure there is accurate communication between me, respondent Mrs. Uma Sekhar, with reference to court orders and each of the prayer points P-DD, and A-N.
- During her stay in Bengaluru, I and Mrs. Uma Sekhar conduct a 'Joint court orders and follow through media conference', giving news for India and World media houses, about the 'breach of PCT', issued 'Consent letter', 'Project Earthling©', and 'Macro program projected events timeline' for the execution of 62 sale agreements, concluding the 'cause of action'.

Bengaluru

Date: 10/6/2025

APPELLANT

Party in Person

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU**  
**APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

Srinivas S. Devathi, 63, 11<sup>th</sup> B Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560079, INDIA

Mobile (91)-966-393-2293

E-mail ID: ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com

**.... Appellant and Party-in-Person**

**AND:**

Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs

Legal and Treaties Division, Ph:91-11-24674143.

Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also

representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.

**.... Respondent**

**VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT**

I, Srinivas S. Devathi, an Indian citizen, aged about 48 years, S/O Late D. Satyanarayana, residing at No. 63, 11<sup>th</sup> B Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Main, Prashanthnagar, Bengaluru 560079, INDIA, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows: I state that I am the appellant in this writ appeal. I know the facts and circumstances of the writ appeal. Hence, I am swearing to this affidavit. Further, I state that I do not have any lawyer, and any law firm, representing me in this writ appeal. And that I am appearing as party-in-person in front of the Honorable court.

TRUE COPY

I submit the 'Memo under order XXVII, rule 6 of CPC'. **4 Pages.**

Identified by his D.L.  
No. KA02 20210015226



Bengaluru

Date: 10/06/25.

This is the Annexure A2 stated in the  
Affidavit of SRINIVAS S. DEVATHI

M. S. BALLAL  
Advocate & Notary (Govt. Of India)  
Bengaluru, Reg. No. 2374, Expiry dt. 30.03.2028.

DEPONENT

"Sworn to before me"

Sworn / Solemnly affirmed and signed before me  
on this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025 at Bengaluru  
N.R.SI.No. 1847 Corrections: Nil

M. S. BALLAL., Advocate & Notary, Bengaluru.



8/5/25, 4:08 PM

High Court of Karnataka



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA



Search



☛ > Case Status > Case Status

◀ back

**Status: Disposed**

Case Number: **WA 886/2025**  
(KAHC010343742025)

Classification: **IPR**

Date of Filing: **02/06/2025**  
**15:55:25**

Petitioner:  
**SRINIVAS.S.DEVATHI**

Petitioner Advocate:

Respondent: **UNION OF INDIA**

Respondent Advocate:

Filing No.: **WA 820/2025**

Judge: **K.S.MUDAGAL AND**  
**M.G.S. KAMAL**

Last Posted For: **ORDERS**

Date of Decision: **04/08/2025**

Last Action Taken: **DISMISSED**

Next Hearing Date: **04/08/2025**

Prayer Details: **WA 886/2025**

*[Handwritten signature]*

PARTY IN PERSON HAS FURNISHED FORM-A AND FORM-B AS PER PARTY IN PERSON COMMITTEE RULES

POST THIS WRIT APPEAL FOR ORDERS BEFORE PARTY IN PERSON COMMITTEE

REG

CONSIDERATION OF FORM-A AND FORM-B

VM

11.06.2025

THIS WRIT APPEAL FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO

CF INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT

APPEAL IS IN TIME/BARRED BY TIME

PARTY IN PERSON HAS NOT COMPLIED THE FOLLOWING OFFICE OBJECTION

1. JURISDICTION TO BE CORRECTED AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA IS MY ORIGINAL APPELLANT JURISDICTION

2. EMAIL ID TO BE CORRECTED AT CAUSE TITLE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 2, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

EMAIL ID IS ACCURATED AND IS A SUBJECT OF WP 24623/204 LIKE EXPLAINED IN WRIT APPEAL

3. INTERIM PRAYER PARA TO BE REMOVED

4. WRIT APPEAL PRAYER TO BE RESTRICTED TO SET ASIDE SINGLE JUDGE ORDER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 3 AND 4, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

PRAYER POINTS TABLE PRINTED FOR COMPARISON. PRAYER FOR GIVING ORDERS DIRECTLY TO DB, WIPO WITH ME INTRODUCING THE MACRO ECONOMIC REFORM PROJECT EARTHING (c), MY AUTHORED WORK, ADDRESSING THE WIPO ASSEMBLY.

5. VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT TO BE FILED AS PER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 5, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT IS ACCURATE

6. WRIT PETITION ORDER COPY NOT TO BE MARKED AS ANNEXURE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 7, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

IT WAS ALLOWED IN THE PAST. IMPUGNED ORDERS ARE ANNEXURE-A

7. WRIT PETITION APPLICATION COPY TO BE PLACED AFTER P ORDER COPY AND FOLLOWED BY WP ANNEXURES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

WP VOLUME 1 STITCHED AFTER WA ANNEXURES, FORM A, FORM B AND IS FOLLOWED BY INDEX, REST OF THE VOLUMES, MEMOS INCLUDING ANNEXURES.

8. WRIT PETITION ANNEXURES TO BE MARKED ACCORDING TO ITS DESCRIPTION THE SAME WILL BE VERIFIED LATER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

THEY ARE MARKED ACCORDING TO DESCRIPTION

9. PAPERS AT ANNEXURE FF TO BE STITCHED HORIZONTALLY





FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
IN ANNEXURE-FF OF WP ALL PAGES ARE PORTRAIT ORIENTATION. FOR ANNEXURE EE1 OF WP, COMPLIED.

10. SEPARATE INDEX TO BE PRODUCED FOR EACH VOLUME CONSISTING OF DETAILED DESCRIPTION

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 10, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
INDEX OF ALL WP VOLUMES AND MEMO ARE STITCHED WITH WA

11. SEPARATE IA TO BE FILED FOR PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS INSTEAD OF MEMO

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 11, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED WITH WA, AND NOT ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

12. EACH ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO BE SWORN BEFORE COMPETENT AUTHORITY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 12, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
NO ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED, ONLY SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

13. PAPERS TO BE SPLIT INTO SEPARATE VOLUMES WHICH EXCEEDS 250 PAGES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 13, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH SO MANY VOLUMES FOR WP, I AVOIDED SPLITTING THE WRIT APPEAL INTO TWO VOLUMES, KINDLY ALLOW

14. FORM-A AND FORM-B TO BE PRODUCED AS PER PARTY-IN-PERSON COMMITTEE RULES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 14, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
FORM A IS PAGE 435, FORM B IS PAGES 436-438

15. THERE IS DELAY IN FILING THIS WRIT APPEAL, IA NOT FILED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 15, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

THIS WA IS FILED FOLLOWING WA 983/2024 WHICH WAS DISPOSED, DISMISSED FOR NON COMPLIANCE OF OFFICE  
OBJECTION, AND NOT ON POINT OF LAW AND PATENT COOPERATION TREATY. THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED BY  
COMPLYING THOSE LIST OF OFFICE OBJECTION, AND FOR THE FULL REGAL RESOLUTION OF CAUSE OF ACTION,  
EXECUTION OF 62 SALE AGREEMENT

16. CERTIFIED COPY OF WP ORDER TO BE PRODUCED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

WITH THE QR CODE, I SUBMITTED THE ORDER COPY FROM HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA WEBSITE. A CERTIFIED COPY  
WOULD BE PRODUCED WITHIN FEW WEEKS. CERTIFIED COPIES APPLICATION PLACED.

17. PAPERS TO BE PROPERLY PAGINATED AND INDEX TO BE FILLED ACCORDINGLY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 17, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
INDEX IS PRESENT FOR ALL VOLUMES, LIKE EXPLAINED IN VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT

18. PAPERS PRODUCED AFTER WP ORDER COPY TO BE CLARIFIED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 18, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
THE ANNEXURES B-T ARE CLEARLY DESCRIBED IN THE WRIT APPEAL MEMO



19. ENTIRE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES TO BE PRODUCED IN FIRST VOLUME OF WRIT APPEAL

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 19, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
STITCHED WITH THE WRIT APPEAL, ARE THE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES AND MEMOS

20. IA TO BE FILED INSTEAD OF MEMO WHICH IS FILED UNDER 27 RULE 6 OF CPC

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH REFERENCE OF THE MEMO FILED UNDER ORDER XXVII, RULE 6 OF CPC ON 11.06.2025

- EXTREMELY HIGH VALUED PATENT, MY INVENTION SYSTEMS AND METHODS
- BREACH OF PATENT CO OPERATION TREATY, SIGNED BY 158 WORLD COUNTRIES,
- MY PATENT CONNECTED WITH 62 COUNTRIES
- PROJECT EARTHLING (C) MUST BE INTRODUCED BY ME AT WIPO ASSEMBLY ADDRESSING 193 WORLD COUNTRY DELEGATES, IT IS ESSENTIAL, AND REQUIRED TO HAVE MRS. UMA SEKHAR, ADDITIONAL SECRETORY, LEGAL AND TREATIES DIVISION, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, THE PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS, TO ATTEND THE COURT HEARINGS AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS RELATING THE SUIT, AND THE DISCUSSION SUBJECTS LISTED IN THE MEMO RELATING THE INTERIM PRAYER POINTS O-DD, AND PRAYER POINTS A-N. I ALSO INDICATE THAT THERE IS URGENCY TO HEAR FROM MRS. UMA SEKHAR, SINCE HONOURABLE COURT ISSUED ORDERS FOR ISSUING THE CONSENT LETTER ON 14.06.2024, WITH A DUE DATE OF 14.12.2024, AND WP 13823/2023 WITH THE INTERIM RELIEF PRAYER WAS FILED ON 30.06.2025

PARTY IN PERSON HAS FILED MEMO ON 11.06.2025

MEMO

PARTY IN PERSON REQUEST THE HONOURABLE COURT TO ISSUE ORDERS, FOR THE ATTENDANCE OF PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS RELATING TO SUIT AS STATED THEREIN

POST THIS WRIT APPEAL FOR ORDERS BEFORE DIVISION BENCH  
REG

1. OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1 TO 20 ALONG WITH COUNSEL SUBMISSION

(ADDITIONAL SOLICITOR GENERAL SERVED)

NOTE- NAYANA TARA B. G ADVOCATE FILED MOA FOR RESPONDENT No. 1

NOTE- FORM C ISSUED ON 12.06.2025, THE SAME IS KEPT IN THIS FILE

VM

04.07.2025

VIDE COURT ORDER DATED 10.07.2025, PARTY IN PERSON HAS NOT COMPLIED THE FOLLOWING OFFICE OBJECTION  
1. JURISDICTION TO BE CORRECTED AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA IS MY ORIGINAL APPELLANT JURISDICTION

2. EMAIL ID TO BE CORRECTED AT CAUSE TITLE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 2, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
EMAIL ID IS ACCURATED AND IS A SUBJECT OF WP 24623/204 LIKE EXPLAINED IN WRIT APPEAL

3. INTERIM PRAYER PARA TO BE REMOVED

4. WRIT APPEAL PRAYER TO BE RESTRICTED TO SET ASIDE SINGLE JUDGE ORDER





FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 3 AND 4, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

PRAYER POINTS TABLE PRINTED FOR COMPARISON. PRAYER FOR GIVING ORDERS DIRECTLY TO DB, WIPO WITH ME INTRODUCING THE MACRO ECONOMIC REFORM PROJECT EARTHING (c), MY AUTHORED WORK, ADDRESSING THE WIPO ASSEMBLY.

5. VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT TO BE FILED AS PER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 5, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT IS ACCURATE

6. WRIT PETITION ORDER COPY NOT TO BE MARKED AS ANNEXURE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 7, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
IT WAS ALLOWED IN THE PAST. IMPUGNED ORDERS ARE ANNEXURE-A

7. WRIT PETITION APPLICATION COPY TO BE PLACED AFTER P ORDER COPY AND FOLLOWED BY WP ANNEXURES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WP VOLUME 1 STITCHED AFTER WA ANNEXURES, FORM A, FORM B AND IS FOLLOWED BY INDEX, REST OF THE VOLUMES, MEMOS INCLUDING ANNEXURES.

8. WRIT PETITION ANNEXURES TO BE MARKED ACCORDING TO ITS DESCRIPTION THE SAME WILL BE VERIFIED LATER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
THEY ARE MARKED ACCORDING TO DESCRIPTION

9. PAPERS AT ANNEXURE FF TO BE STITCHED HORIZONTALLY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
IN ANNEXURE-FF OF WP ALL PAGES ARE PORTRAIT ORIENTATION. FOR ANNEXURE EE1 OF WP, COMPLIED.

10. SEPARATE INDEX TO BE PRODUCED FOR EACH VOLUME CONSISTING OF DETAILED DESCRIPTION

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 10, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
INDEX OF ALL WP VOLUMES AND MEMO ARE STITCHED WITH WA

11. SEPARATE IA TO BE FILED FOR PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS INSTEAD OF MEMO

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 11, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED WITH WA, AND NOT ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS


12. EACH ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO BE SWORN BEFORE COMPETENT AUTHORITY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 12, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
NO ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED, ONLY SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

13. PAPERS TO BE SPLIT INTO SEPARATE VOLUMES WHICH EXCEEDS 250 PAGES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 13, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH SO MANY VOLUMES FOR WP, I AVOIDED SPLITTING THE WRIT APPEAL INTO TWO VOLUMES, KINDLY ALLOW

14. FORM-A AND FORM-B TO BE PRODUCED AS PER PARTY-IN-PERSON COMMITTEE RULES





FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 14, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
FORM A IS PAGE 435, FORM B IS PAGES 436-438

15. THERE IS DELAY IN FILING THIS WRIT APPEAL, IA NOT FILED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 15, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
THIS WA IS FILED FOLLOWING WA 983/2024 WHICH WAS DISPOSED, DISMISSED FOR NON COMPLIANCE OF OFFICE OBJECTION, AND NOT ON POINT OF LAW AND PATENT COOPERATION TREATY. THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED BY COMPLYING THOSE LIST OF OFFICE OBJECTION, AND FOR THE FULL REGAL RESOLUTION OF CAUSE OF ACTION, EXECUTION OF 62 SALE AGREEMENT

16. CERTIFIED COPY OF WP ORDER TO BE PRODUCED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH THE QR CODE, I SUBMITTED THE ORDER COPY FROM HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA WEBSITE. A CERTIFIED COPY WOULD BE PRODUCED WITHIN FEW WEEKS. CERTIFIED COPIES APPLICATION PLACED.

17. PAPERS TO BE PROPERLY PAGINATED AND INDEX TO BE FILLED ACCORDINGLY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 17, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
INDEX IS PRESENT FOR ALL VOLUMES, LIKE EXPLAINED IN VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT

18. PAPERS PRODUCED AFTER WP ORDER COPY TO BE CLARIFIED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 18, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
THE ANNEXURES B-T ARE CLEARLY DESCRIBED IN THE WRIT APPEAL MEMO

19. ENTIRE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES TO BE PRODUCED IN FIRST VOLUME OF WRIT APPEAL

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 19, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
STITCHED WITH THE WRIT APPEAL, ARE THE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES AND MEMOS

20. IA TO BE FILED INSTEAD OF MEMO WHICH IS FILED UNDER 27 RULE 6 OF CPC

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH REFERENCE OF THE MEMO FILED UNDER ORDER XXVII, RULE 6 OF CPC ON 11.06.2025

- EXTREMELY HIGH VALUED PATENT, MY INVENTION SYSTEMS AND METHODS

- BREACH OF PATENT CO OPERATION TREATY, SIGNED BY 158 WORLD COUNTRIES,

- MY PATENT CONNECTED WITH 62 COUNTRIES

- PROJECT EARTHLING (C) MUST BE INTRODUCED BY ME AT WIPO ASSEMBLY ADDRESSING 193 WORLD COUNTRY DELEGATES, IT IS ESSENTIAL, AND REQUIRED TO HAVE MRS. UMA SEKHAR, ADDITIONAL SECRETORY, LEGAL AND TREATIES DIVISION, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, THE PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS, TO ATTEND THE COURT HEARINGS AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS RELATING THE SUIT, AND THE DISCUSSION SUBJECTS LISTED IN THE MEMO RELATING THE INTERIM PRAYER POINTS O-DD, AND PRAYER POINTS A-N. I ALSO INDICATE THAT THERE IS URGENCY TO HEAR FROM MRS. UMA SEKHAR, SINCE HONOURABLE COURT ISSUED ORDERS FOR ISSUING THE CONSENT LETTER ON 14.06.2024, WITH A DUE DATE OF 14.12.2024, AND WP 13823/2023 WITH THE INTERIM RELIEF PRAYER WAS FILED ON 30.06.2025

PARTY IN PERSON HAS FILED MEMO ON 11.06.2025

MEMO



PARTY IN PERSON REQUEST THE HONOURABLE COURT TO ISSUE ORDERS, FOR THE ATTENDANCE OF PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS RELATING TO SUIT AS STATED THEREIN

POST THIS WRIT APPEAL FOR ADMISSION BEFORE DIVISION BENCH AS DIRECTED  
REG

1. OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1 TO 20 ALONG WITH COUNSEL SUBMISSION

(ADDITIONAL SOLICITOR GENERAL SERVED)

NOTE- NAYANA TARA B. G ADVOCATE FILED MOA FOR RESPONDENT No. 1

NOTE- FORM C ISSUED ON 12.06.2025, THE SAME IS KEPT IN THIS FILE

VM  
15.07.2025

VIDE COURT ORDER DATED 16.07.2025, THE WRIT APPEAL TO BE LISTED BEFORE THE SAME BENCH WHICH HAS PASSED THE ORDER ON 22.04.2025 IN WA 983/2024

AS VERIFIED IT IS FOUND THAT, WRIT APPEAL No. 983/2024 WAS LISTED BEFORE HONBLE KSMJ AND MGSKJ ON 22.04.2025 AND SAME WAS DISPOSED OFF ON 22.04.2025

PARTY IN PERSON HAS ATTENDED OFFICE OBJECTIONS AND GIVEN SUBMISSION TO THE FOLLOWING OFFICE OBJECTION

1. JURISDICTION TO BE CORRECTED AT WRIT APPEAL MEMORANDUM

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA IS MY ORIGINAL APPELLANT JURISDICTION

2. EMAIL ID TO BE CORRECTED AT CAUSE TITLE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 2, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
EMAIL ID IS ACCURATED AND IS A SUBJECT OF WP 24623/204 LIKE EXPLAINED IN WRIT APPEAL

3. INTERIM PRAYER PARA TO BE REMOVED

4. WRIT APPEAL PRAYER TO BE RESTRICTED TO SET ASIDE SINGLE JUDGE ORDER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 3 AND 4, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

PRAYER POINTS TABLE PRINTED FOR COMPARISON. PRAYER FOR GIVING ORDERS DIRECTLY TO DB, WIPO WITH ME INTRODUCING THE MACRO ECONOMIC REFORM PROJECT EARTHING (c), MY AUTHORED WORK, ADDRESSING THE WIPO ASSEMBLY.

5. VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT TO BE FILED AS PER

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 5, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT IS ACCURATE

6. WRIT PETITION ORDER COPY NOT TO BE MARKED AS ANNEXURE

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 7, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
IT WAS ALLOWED IN THE PAST. IMPUGNED ORDERS ARE ANNEXURE-A

7. WRIT PETITION APPLICATION COPY TO BE PLACED AFTER P ORDER COPY AND FOLLOWED BY WP ANNEXURES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER



WP VOLUME 1 STITCHED AFTER WA ANNEXURES, FORM A, FORM B AND IS FOLLOWED BY INDEX, REST OF THE VOLUMES, MEMOS INCLUDING ANNEXURES.

8. WRIT PETITION ANNEXURES TO BE MARKED ACCORDING TO ITS DESCRIPTION THE SAME WILL BE VERIFIED LATER FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 8, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER THEY ARE MARKED ACCORDING TO DESCRIPTION

9. PAPERS AT ANNEXURE FF TO BE STITCHED HORIZONTALLY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER IN ANNEXURE-FF OF WP ALL PAGES ARE PORTRAIT ORIENTATION. FOR ANNEXURE EE1 OF WP, COMPLIED.

10. SEPARATE INDEX TO BE PRODUCED FOR EACH VOLUME CONSISTING OF DETAILED DESCRIPTION

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 10, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER INDEX OF ALL WP VOLUMES AND MEMO ARE STITCHED WITH WA

11. SEPARATE IA TO BE FILED FOR PRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS INSTEAD OF MEMO

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 11, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED WITH WA, AND NOT ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

12. EACH ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS TO BE SWORN BEFORE COMPETENT AUTHORITY

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 12, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER NO ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED, ONLY SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

13. PAPERS TO BE SPLIT INTO SEPARATE VOLUMES WHICH EXCEEDS 250 PAGES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 13, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER WITH SO MANY VOLUMES FOR WP, I AVOIDED SPLITTING THE WRIT APPEAL INTO TWO VOLUMES, KINDLY ALLOW

14. FORM-A AND FORM-B TO BE PRODUCED AS PER PARTY-IN-PERSON COMMITTEE RULES

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 14, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER FORM A IS PAGE 435, FORM B IS PAGES 436-438

15. THERE IS DELAY IN FILING THIS WRIT APPEAL, IA NOT FILED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 15, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

THIS WA IS FILED FOLLOWING WA 983/2024 WHICH WAS DISPOSED, DISMISSED FOR NON COMPLIANCE OF OFFICE OBJECTION, AND NOT ON POINT OF LAW AND PATENT COOPERATION TREATY. THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED BY COMPLYING THOSE LIST OF OFFICE OBJECTION, AND FOR THE FULL REGAL RESOLUTION OF CAUSE OF ACTION, EXECUTION OF 62 SALE AGREEMENT

16. CERTIFIED COPY OF WP ORDER TO BE PRODUCED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER

WITH THE QR CODE, I SUBMITTED THE ORDER COPY FROM HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA WEBSITE. A CERTIFIED COPY WOULD BE PRODUCED WITHIN FEW WEEKS. CERTIFIED COPIES APPLICATION PLACED.

17. PAPERS TO BE PROPERLY PAGINATED AND INDEX TO BE FILLED ACCORDINGLY





— A1 —

8/5/25, 4:08 PM

High Court of Karnataka

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 17, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
INDEX IS PRESENT FOR ALL VOLUMES, LIKE EXPLAINED IN VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT

18. PAPERS PRODUCED AFTER WP ORDER COPY TO BE CLARIFIED

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 18, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
THE ANNEXURES B-T ARE CLEARLY DESCRIBED IN THE WRIT APPEAL MEMO

19. ENTIRE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES TO BE PRODUCED IN FIRST VOLUME OF WRIT APPEAL

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 19, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
STITCHED WITH THE WRIT APPEAL, ARE THE INDEX OF ALL VOLUMES AND MEMOS

20. IA TO BE FILED INSTEAD OF MEMO WHICH IS FILED UNDER 27 RULE 6 OF CPC

FOR THE ABOVE OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1, PARTY IN PERSON HAS GIVEN SUBMISSION WHICH READS AS UNDER  
WITH REFERENCE OF THE MEMO FILED UNDER ORDER XXVII, RULE 6 OF CPC ON 11.06.2025

- EXTREMELY HIGH VALUED PATENT, MY INVENTION SYSTEMS AND METHODS

- BREACH OF PATENT CO OPERATION TREATY, SIGNED BY 158 WORLD COUNTRIES,

- MY PATENT CONNECTED WITH 62 COUNTRIES

- PROJECT EARTHLING (C) MUST BE INTRODUCED BY ME AT WIPO ASSEMBLY ADDRESSING 193 WORLD COUNTRY DELEGATES, IT IS ESSENTIAL, AND REQUIRED TO HAVE MRS. UMA SEKHAR, ADDITIONAL SECRETARY, LEGAL AND TREATIES DIVISION, MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, THE PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER THE QUESTIONS, TO ATTEND THE COURT HEARINGS AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS RELATING THE SUIT, AND THE DISCUSSION SUBJECTS LISTED IN THE MEMO RELATING THE INTERIM PRAYER POINTS O-DD, AND PRAYER POINTS A-N. I ALSO INDICATE THAT THERE IS URGENCY TO HEAR FROM MRS. UMA SEKHAR, SINCE HONOURABLE COURT ISSUED ORDERS FOR ISSUING THE CONSENT LETTER ON 14.06.2024, WITH A DUE DATE OF 14.12.2024, AND WP 13823/2023 WITH THE INTERIM RELIEF PRAYER WAS FILED ON 30.06.2025

PARTY IN PERSON HAS FILED MEMO ON 11.06.2025

MEMO

PARTY IN PERSON REQUEST THE HONOURABLE COURT TO ISSUE ORDERS, FOR THE ATTENDANCE OF PERSON ABLE TO ANSWER QUESTIONS RELATING TO SUIT AS STATED THEREIN

POST THIS WRIT APPEAL FOR ORDERS BEFORE DIVISION BENCH  
REG

1. OFFICE OBJECTION No. 1 TO 20 ALONG WITH COUNSEL SUBMISSION

(ADDITIONAL SOLICITOR GENERAL SERVED)

NOTE- NAYANA TARA B. G ADVOCATE FILED MOA FOR RESPONDENT No. 1


NOTE- FORM C ISSUED ON 12.06.2025, THE SAME IS KEPT IN THIS FILE

THE WRIT APPEAL TO BE LISTED BEFORE THE SAME BENCH WHICH HAS PASSED THE ORDER ON 22.04.2025 IN WA 983/2024 AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 16.07.2025

VM  
22.07.2025

8/5/25, 4:08 PM

High Court of Karnataka

[Feedback](#) | [Website Policies](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Accessibility Statement](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Content Maintained by Computer Main Center(CMC)

Designed by NIC in association with CMC, High Court of Karnataka

Hosted By : CENTRE FOR e-GOVERNANCE, Government of Karnataka

HCK-WEB-VP04 | Todays Visitor Count: 61313 | Visitor Count: 4513761 [Since 05/05/2025]



This is the Annexure **A3** stated in the  
Affidavit of **SRINIVAS . S. DEVATHI**

**M. S. BALLAL**  
Advocate & Notary (Govt. Of India)  
Bengaluru, Reg. No. 2374, Expiry dt. 30.03.2028.



8/6/25, 9:40 AM

High Court of Karnataka



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA



ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಉಚ್ಚ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ

HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA



Search



Case Status &gt; Case Status

[back](#)Status: **Disposed**Case Number: **WA 886/2025**  
(KAHC010343742025)Classification: **IPR**Date of Filing: **02/06/2025**  
**15:55:25**Petitioner:  
**SRINIVAS.S.DEVATHI**

Petitioner Advocate:

Respondent: **UNION OF INDIA**

Respondent Advocate:

Filing No.: **WA 820/2025**Judge: **K.S.MUDAGAL AND**  
**M.G.S. KAMAL**Last Posted For: **ORDERS**Date of Decision: **04/08/2025**Last Action Taken: **DISMISSED**Next Hearing Date: **04/08/2025****Daily Orders: WA 886/2025**

|   |  |                   |
|---|--|-------------------|
| 1 | K.S.MUDAGAL AND M.G.S. KAMAL   | <u>04/08/2025</u> |
|   | Dismissed as not maintainable  |                   |
| 2 | ANU SIVARAMAN AND DR. K.MANMADHA RAO   | <u>10/07/2025</u> |
|   | List for 'Admission' along with counsel submission on 15.07.2025.  |                   |
| 3 | ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE AND C M JOSHI   | <u>08/07/2025</u> |
|   | Subject to the orders of the Acting Chief Justice on the administrative side, list this appeal before a Bench of which one of us C.M. Joshi J., is not a member.<br>Re-notify on 10.07.2025. |                   |

[Feedback](#) | [Website Policies](#) | [Disclaimer](#) | [Accessibility Statement](#) | [Contact Us](#)

— AA —

Annexure A A — Page 2

8/6/25, 9:40 AM

High Court of Karnataka



Content Maintained by Computer Main Center(CMC)

Designed by NIC in association with CMC, High Court of Karnataka

Hosted By : CENTRE FOR e-GOVERNANCE, Government of Karnataka

HCK-WEB-VP04 | Todays Visitor Count: 9321 | Visitor Count: 4576503 [Since 05/05/2025]



*[Handwritten signature]*

This is the Annexure AA stated in the  
Affidavit of SRINIVAS S. DEVATHI

*[Handwritten signature]*

M. S. BALLAL  
Advocate & Notary (Govt. Of India)  
Bengaluru, Reg. No. 2374, Expiry dt. 30.03.2028.



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BENGALURU  
APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**W.A. No. 886 /2025**

**BETWEEN:**

Srinivas S. Devathi, 63, 11<sup>th</sup> B Cross, 3<sup>rd</sup> Main, Prashanthnagar,  
Bengaluru 560079, INDIA

Mobile (91)-966-393-2293

E-mail ID: ProjectEarthling@SrinivasDevathi.com

**.... Appellant and Party-in-Person**

**AND:**

Union of India, Ministry of External Affairs

Legal and Treaties Division, Ph:91-11-24674143.

Represented by Mrs. Uma Sekhar, Additional Secretary, also  
representing External Affairs Minister Mr. S. Jaishankar.


**.... Respondent**

**VERIFYING AFFIDAVIT**

I, Srinivas S. Devathi, an Indian citizen, aged about 48 years, S/O Late D. Satyanarayana, residing at No. 63, 11th B Cross, 3rd Main, Prashanthnagar, Bengaluru 560079, INDIA, do hereby solemnly affirm and state on oath as follows: I state that I am the appellant in this writ appeal. I know the facts and circumstances of the writ appeal. Hence, I am swearing to this affidavit. Further, I state that I do not have any lawyer, and any law firm, representing me in this writ appeal. And that I am appearing as party-in-person in front of the Honorable court.

I submit 'Application for restoration of Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, arising from Honorable court orders for Writ Petition WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024, and facts'. I include Annexures A1, A2, A3, and A4 with this application for restoration of WA 886/2025. Annexure A1 is certified true copy of Honorable court orders for WP 12356/2023, dated 14-6-2024. Annexure A2 is true copy. Annexures A3, and A4 are Originals. **44 Pages.**

With reference to annexure S of Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, since I have not received instructions from the Honorable court, I have two bottles of pepsi 750 ml, tagged with WA number WA 886/2025 with me. I will mention and leave them in the custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or



No. of Corrections: Nil.

retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC.

With reference to annexure T of Writ Appeal WA 886/2025, since I have not received instructions from the Honorable court, I have two lenovo laptops, tagged with WA number WA 886/2025, and their respective two charging cords with me. I will mention and leave them in the custody of Honorable Chief Justice, or retain them with me for further instructions, according to prayer point CC.



Identified by his PL.No.  
KA0220210015226.

Bengaluru

Date: 07-08-25

DEPONENT

"Sworn to before me"

Sworn / Solemnly affirmed and signed before me  
on this 07th day of Aug 2025 at Bengaluru  
N.R.SI.No. 2706 Corrections Nil.

MSB  
07/08/25  
M. S. BALLAL, Advocate & Notary, Bengaluru