Gurukul International Multidisciplinary Research Journal (GIMRJ)*with* International Impact Factor 8.357
Peer Reviewed Journal

https://doi.org/10.69758/GIMRJ/2510S01V13P006

e-ISSN No. 2394-8426
Special Issue on Scientific Research Oct'25
Issue–X(I), Volume–XIII

The Law of Injunctions in India under the provisions of CPC and SRA: A Jural Analysis of Principles, Discretion, and Enforcement

Author:
Abhijeet U. Khot
Research Scholar
[B.Com., LL.M., PGD in Cyber Law]
Department of Law
Sant Gadge Baba Amravati University, Amravati
Mob. 8600060665
Email: abhijeetudaykhot@gmail.com
Address: 501, Pushpshri Apartment,
Ganuwadi, MIDC Road, Amravati, 444607

Co-author (Research Supervisor):
Prof. Dr. Bhagyashree A. Deshpande
Professor
[B.E. LL.M. Ph.D. (Law)]
Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh College of Law, Amravati
Mob. 9822724558
Email: bhagyashri.deshpande72@gmail.com
Address: B-101, Vijay Rudra Apts.
Ashiyad Colony, Shegaon Road, Amravati, 444604

Abstract:

This paper presents a comprehensive jural analysis of the law governing temporary injunctions within the Indian civil legal system. A temporary injunction is a provisional, discretionary, and equitable remedy designed to preserve the status quo of a suit's subject matter pending final adjudication. Its legal framework is rooted in the Specific Relief Act, 1963 (SRA, 1963), which defines its substantive character, and the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC, 1908), which outlines the procedural mechanics under Order XXXIX. The grant of this remedy is not an arbitrary exercise of judicial power but is contingent upon satisfying a foundational tripartite test: establishing a *prima facie* case, demonstrating that the balance of convenience lies in the applicant's favour, and proving potential irreparable loss that cannot be adequately compensated by monetary damages. The paper explores the application of these principles across various forms of injunctive relief, including prohibitory, *ad-interim*, and mandatory injunctions, and in diverse legal contexts. Ultimately, this research posits that the law of temporary injunctions represents a structured, principled judicial determination, ensuring the remedy functions as a crucial tool to prevent the ends of justice from being defeated.

Introduction:

The law of temporary injunctions represents a critical intersection of substantive rights and procedural justice in the Indian civil legal system. A temporary injunction is a provisional remedy granted by a civil court to preserve the subject matter of a suit in its existing condition pending final adjudication. The substantive character is defined in Section 37 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 (SRA, 1963), which states that "temporary injunctions are such as are to continue until a specified time, or until the further order of the court, and they may be granted at any stage of a suit". The procedural mechanics are codified in the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC, 1963). Section 94(c) and (e) empower the court to grant a temporary injunction or make other interlocutory orders to prevent the ends of justice from being defeated, while Order XXXIX provides the detailed rules. This separation of substance from procedure signifies that while the remedy's application is governed by procedural law, its essence is equitable. This duality is the source of the court's wide discretion, as the law provides the instrument (CPC), but equity (the spirit of the Specific Relief Act) guides its use. The primary objective is not to resolve the dispute but to maintain the *status quo*. As held in Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Company, its purpose is "to protect the plaintiff against injury by violation of his right for which he could not be adequately compensated in damages"[i]. At a preliminary stage, the court must balance the plaintiff's need for immediate protection against the defendant's right to unencumbered action. This paper analyses this complex judicial exercise, deconstructing the core principles, evaluating the influence of equity, examining their application in various contexts, and analysing the mechanisms for enforcement and the consequences of disobedience.

Keywords:

Temporary Injunction, SRA, CPC, Order XXXIX, Equitable Remedy, Judicial Discretion, Ad Interim Injunction, Mandatory Injunction, Status Quo, Lis Pendens, Clean Hands Doctrine, Acquiescence.

Objectives:

The primary objective of this paper is to conduct a comprehensive jurisprudential analysis of the principles governing temporary injunctions in Indian civil law. To achieve this, the analysis will pursue the following specific aims:

- To deconstruct the three-fold judicial test i.e., *prima facie* case, balance of convenience, and irreparable injury.
- To critically evaluate the indispensable role of equitable maxims, including the doctrines of "clean hands" and "delay defeats equity", in shaping judicial discretion.
- To differentiate the legal standards applied to various forms of injunctive relief, contrasting prohibitory injunctions with the stricter requirements for *ad interim* and mandatory injunctions.
- To map the application of these principles across diverse legal contexts, including property disputes, specific performance suits, and actions against statutory bodies, synthesizing guidance from cited judicial pronouncements.
- To analyze the legal framework for enforcing injunctions and the consequences of their breach under Order XXXIX, Rule 2A and Order XXI, Rule 32 of the CPC.

Hypothesis:

The grant of temporary injunctions in Indian civil law, though discretionary, is exercised in a structured and principled manner grounded in the mandatory satisfaction of a *prima facie* case, balance of convenience, and irreparable harm. Judicial discretion in such matters is further guided by equitable considerations and heightened scrutiny in cases involving mandatory or *ex parte* relief, ensuring that interim orders function as safeguards against injustice rather than instruments of unfair advantage.

Research Methodology:

Research Methodology adopted for the writing this research paper is Doctrinal Research Method (Methodology).

The Foundational Triad – Deconstructing the Core Requirements:

Judicial discretion in granting a temporary injunction is anchored to a foundational triad of principles, the satisfaction of which is a condition precedent for relief. These principles i.e., a *prima facie* case, the balance of convenience, and the potential for irreparable loss were authoritatively explained by the Supreme Court in Dalpat's[ii] case and form the bedrock of injunctive jurisprudence.

***Prima Facie* Case:**

The first requirement is establishing a '*prima facie* case'. This does not mean the plaintiff must present a case certain to succeed, but rather that the contentions are substantial and require a trial for resolution. As clarified, a *prima facie* case exists when the claims "require consideration in merit and are not liable to be rejected summarily"[iii]. It is a threshold inquiry to filter out frivolous claims, ensuring the court's power is invoked only for a bona fide legal dispute. The plaintiff must also show a concluded right capable of being enforced by injunction.

Balance of Convenience:

The second pillar is the 'balance of convenience'. This requires the court to weigh the inconvenience and hardship likely to be suffered by the plaintiff if the injunction is refused against the hardship likely to befall the defendant if it is granted. If the comparative hardship from withholding the injunction is greater than that from granting it, the balance lies in the plaintiff's favour. This assessment is fact dependent, requiring consideration of the specific circumstances.

Irreparable Loss:

The final element is demonstrating 'irreparable loss'. Legally, "irreparable" refers to an injury for which monetary damages would not be an adequate remedy. The court's interference is necessary to protect a party from an injury so material that it could not be justly compensated in money. An injury is often considered irreparable when it is continuous and repeated, requiring a multiplicity of suits for redress, or when the threatening party is insolvent. While difficulty in quantifying damages does not automatically establish irreparable injury, an injunction may be the only appropriate remedy where there is no standard to ascertain the actual damage.

The Superstructure of Equity – Guiding Judicial Discretion:

Beyond the foundational triad, the grant of an injunction is profoundly influenced by equity. An injunction is an equitable remedy, and its discretionary nature means the court is not bound to grant it merely because it is lawful. This imposes a higher standard of conduct on the applicant, turning the judicial inquiry into a *quasi*-moral evaluation of their behaviour.

The "Clean Hands" Doctrine:

The maxim *"he who seeks equity must come with clean hands"* is paramount. A party seeking an injunction must approach the court with utmost candour and good faith. Any suppression of material facts or misrepresentation can be fatal to the application. A party who has suppressed material facts "does not deserve to get any discretionary relief"[iv]. This doctrine operates as a powerful disqualifier, as a plaintiff may be denied relief despite satisfying the three-fold test if their conduct is tainted.

Acquiescence, Laches, and Estoppel:

The principle of "delay defeats equity", or laches, is relevant for *ad interim* and *ex parte* injunctions. Unreasonable delay in approaching the court can be interpreted as acquiescence, suggesting the matter is not urgent and disentitling the plaintiff to immediate relief. Acquiescence, a form of equitable estoppel, arises when a plaintiff, with full knowledge of their rights, has by their conduct encouraged the defendant to act to their detriment. Equitable estoppel prevents a party from asserting rights when another has, in good faith, relied upon that party's conduct and changed their position for the worse.[v]

Procedural Dimensions and Special Forms of Relief:

The procedural framework for injunctions accommodates different levels of urgency, requiring a corresponding escalation in judicial caution.

- *Ad interim* and *Ex parte* Injunctions:

An *ad interim* injunction is granted for a short duration pending a full hearing. When granted *ex parte* (without hearing the defendant), it represents a significant departure from the principle of *audi alteram partem*. Consequently, courts exercise extreme caution. The Supreme Court in Morgan's case[vi] laid down stringent conditions for such orders that: it must be shown that irreparable injury would be caused by delay; the court must consider when the plaintiff became aware of the act; relief should be denied if the plaintiff has acquiesced; and the applicant must act in utmost good faith. The judicial preference is for the "safer course" of giving short notice. To mitigate abuse, courts are advised to grant such orders for very short periods and impose conditions like undertakings to pay realistic costs. The CPC expects such applications to be disposed of within thirty days, with any delay justified in writing.

- Mandatory Injunctions:

A mandatory injunction, defined under Section 39 of the Specific Relief Act, compels a defendant to perform an act to restore things to their former condition. While a prohibitory injunction maintains the *status quo*, a mandatory one alters it. Granting it at the interim stage is rare and reserved for exceptional cases. The judicial standard is therefore significantly higher. In Dorab' case[vii], the Supreme Court established that the plaintiff must have a "strong case for trial" (higher than a *prima facie* case), it must be necessary to prevent irreparable injury, and the balance of convenience must be overwhelmingly in the plaintiff's favour. This power is exercised to restore a *status quo ante* illicitly altered by the defendant, and the court must have a "high degree of assurance" that a similar injunction would likely be granted at trial.

Injunctive Relief in Property and Contractual Disputes:

The principles of injunctive relief find varied application in property and contract disputes, often interacting with other substantive laws.

- Alienation and the Doctrine of *Lis Pendens*:

An injunction to restrain alienation of suit property intersects with the doctrine of *lis pendens*[viii], which provides that any transfer of immovable property during a suit is subject to the final decree. As explained in M/S Kachhi Properties[ix], this statutory protection is often adequate, and courts should be cautious in granting an injunction against alienation where it applies. An injunction should be granted only if *lis pendens* protection is inadequate. A transfer *pendente lite* is not void but is subject to the suit's outcome, whereas a transfer violating a prohibitory order is illegal and void ab initio.

- Disputes among Co-owners, Co-sharers, and Co-parceners:

A co-parcener in a Hindu Undivided Family generally cannot obtain an injunction restraining the *Karta* from alienating family property, as the *Karta* has wide management powers. The appropriate remedy is to challenge the alienation after it occurs. In contrast, a co-owner not in possession cannot seek an injunction against a co-owner in possession unless the latter's act causes prejudice. A co-sharer in exclusive possession of part of the joint property may, however, be entitled to an injunction to protect that possession pending a partition suit.

- Enforcement of Negative Covenants:

Section 42 of the Specific Relief Act allows a court to grant an injunction to perform a negative covenant, i.e., an agreement to refrain from doing something, even if it cannot compel specific performance of the affirmative part. However, as clarified in Percept's case[x], such an injunction cannot be granted if it would effectively compel performance of a personal service contract, amounts to granting the final relief at the interim stage, or if the plaintiff can be adequately compensated in money.

Statutory Bars and Judicial Restraint:

The power to grant an injunction is circumscribed by express statutory prohibitions and principles of judicial comity.

- Prohibitions under Section 41, Specific Relief Act:

Section 41 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963, enumerates circumstances where an injunction cannot be granted, including restraining pending judicial proceedings (unless to prevent a multiplicity of proceedings), restraining proceedings in a court of non-subordinate jurisdiction, interfering in criminal matters, or when an equally efficacious relief is available. These bars are designed to prevent judicial overreach and maintain the hierarchy of courts.

- *Anti* Suit Injunctions:

The concept of an *anti*-suit injunction governs the restraint of proceedings in other courts, including foreign ones, to prevent a multiplicity of proceedings and conflicting judgments. As held in Cotton Corporation[xi], a court is precluded from granting an injunction to stay proceedings in a court of coordinate or superior jurisdiction. The Supreme Court in Modi Entertainment Network[xii] laid down guidelines for such injunctions, emphasizing that the power should be exercised sparingly.

- Injunctions against Government and Statutory Bodies:

When seeking an injunction against the government or a public officer, Section 80 of the CPC mandates a notice before filing the suit. While this can be waived for urgent necessity, no interim relief can be granted without serving notice. Similar requirements exist under various municipal statutes. In cases involving demolition orders, if a plaintiff makes a *prima facie* case that a structure is authorized, the balance of convenience typically tilts in favour of preserving the *status quo*, as demolition would cause irreparable loss. "Due process of law" requires not just a notice but also consideration of the reply and communication of a reasoned decision before coercive action.

Enforcement and Sanctions for Disobedience:

A court's injunction order would be meaningless without a robust enforcement mechanism. Defiance is met with stringent sanctions, as it is an affront to the administration of justice.

- The Scope of Order XXXIX, Rule 2A:

Order XXXIX, Rule 2A of the CPC is the primary provision for dealing with disobedience of a temporary injunction. Its purpose is not merely punitive but is aimed at enforcing the court's order upon proof of "willful disobedience". The proceedings are *quasi*-criminal, meaning the plaintiff must establish the breach beyond a reasonable doubt, including proving the defendant's knowledge of the order. The power must be exercised with great caution, and a breach cannot be inferred based on "surmises, suspicion and inferences".

- Consequences of Breach:

Upon finding a breach, Rule 2A empowers the court to attach the property of the guilty person and detain them in civil prison for up to three months. The attachment can remain for up to one year, after which the property may be sold to compensate the injured party. Additionally, under a Bombay High Court Amendment, Order XXXIX, Rule 11 empowers the court to strike off the defence of a party who commits a breach.

- The Enduring Obligation to Obey:

A fundamental principle is the absolute obligation to obey a court order until it is set aside. The rationale is systemic that if parties could unilaterally decide an order is "wrong" and disobey it, judicial authority would collapse. As established in Tayyabhai[xiii], an injunction must be obeyed even if passed by a court that lacked jurisdiction. The disobedience is not erased even if the order is subsequently vacated, though the punishment may be mitigated. This principle protects the process of justice and the authority of the courts.

Judicial Evolution of Temporary Injunction Jurisprudence in India:

The jurisprudence on temporary injunctions in India has been shaped through a series of significant Supreme Court decisions which have clarified the principles governing interim relief.

The following case summaries trace the development of these guiding principles and highlight the judicial approach toward ensuring that temporary injunctions serve as instruments of justice rather than tools for procedural abuse.

In **Dalpat Kumar v. Prahlad Singh**[xiv], the Supreme Court articulated the most authoritative formulation of the three-fold test governing the grant of temporary injunctions. The Court emphasised that relief at the interim stage requires the applicant to establish a *prima facie* case, demonstrate a balance of convenience in their favour, and prove a likelihood of irreparable loss if relief is denied. This decision continues to remain the principal judicial foundation for injunctive jurisprudence in India.

In **Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co.**[xv], the Supreme Court further reinforced the legal basis for interlocutory injunctions by clarifying that their primary object is to prevent injury that cannot be adequately compensated by damages. The Court underscored the preventive nature of interim relief and reiterated that the remedy is discretionary and must be exercised with caution to secure justice and protect parties from irreparable harm.

The decision in **Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund v. Kartick Das**[xvi] established strict judicial standards for granting *ex-parte ad-interim* injunctions. The Court held that such relief must be granted only in exceptional circumstances, subject to urgency, good faith, and absence of acquiescence on the part of the applicant, stressing that *ex-parte* orders should not become instruments of unfair advantage.

In **Dorab Cawasji Warden v. Coomi Sorab Warden**[xvii], the Supreme Court delineated the heightened criteria applicable to mandatory injunctions. It held that such injunctions, which compel affirmative action, may be issued only in rare and exceptional circumstances where a strong *prima facie* case exists, and where denial of relief would lead to serious injustice that cannot later be remedied.

The judgment in **Anathula Sudhakar v. P. Buchi Reddy**[xviii] clarified the appropriate legal remedies in disputes concerning possession and title. The Court held that an injunction simpliciter is appropriate where possession is established; however, where title is in serious dispute or clouded, a suit for declaration followed by consequential relief is necessary.

In **Maria Margarida Sequeria Fernandes v. Erasmo Jack de Sequeria**[xix], the Supreme Court emphasised the importance of truthful and specific pleadings, particularly in matters relating to possession. The Court additionally encouraged the imposition of realistic costs to deter frivolous and vexatious litigation, thereby promoting responsible conduct in civil disputes.

Manohar Lal Chopra v. Rai Bahadur Rao Raja Seth Hira Lal[xx] affirmed that courts retain inherent powers under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure to grant injunctions even in situations not expressly covered by Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2. The decision reflects judicial recognition of the need for flexible equitable remedies to meet the ends of justice.

In **Tayyabhai M. Bagasarwalla v. Hind Rubber Industries**[xxi], the Supreme Court held that even an injunction passed without jurisdiction must be obeyed until it is set aside by a competent court. The ruling reinforces judicial authority and underscores the principle that court orders must be respected to maintain the rule of law and institutional integrity.

Conclusion:

The grant of a temporary injunction is a delicate judicial balancing act. It cannot be claimed by a party as a matter of right, nor can it be denied by the court arbitrarily. The court's wide discretion is guided by sound judicial principles and depends on the facts of each case. The party seeking this potent equitable relief must not only establish a *prima facie* case but also demonstrate that irreparable loss would occur if relief were denied and that the balance of convenience lies in their favour.

This reaffirms the hypothesis that this discretionary power is not capricious but is anchored to the established tripartite test. The rationale behind Order XXXIX, as summarized in M. Gurudas and Ors. v. Rasaranjan and Ors.[xxii], is that a court must pass an order having regard to *prima facie* case, balance of convenience, and irreparable injury. Ultimately, the temporary injunction is an indispensable tool of civil justice, empowering courts to prevent the litigation process from being subverted and ensuring that the ultimate judgment is not rendered a hollow victory.

Recommendations:

Based on guidance from various judicial pronouncements, the following best practices are recommended for courts to ensure the remedy is used justly:

- Prioritize notice over *ex parte* orders – Prioritize issuing short notice to the opposing party over granting *ex parte* orders, reserving the latter for extreme urgency with recorded reasons.
- Impose Protective Conditions – Routinely impose protective conditions when granting injunctions, such as requiring an undertaking for costs or security to safeguard the defendant's interests.
- Ensure Time-Bound Adjudication – Endeavor to dispose of injunction applications within the stipulated 30-day period, justifying any delay in writing to ensure judicial accountability.
- Strategic Use of Court Commissioners – In property disputes, consider appointing a Court Commissioner at the *ad interim* stage to create an objective record of the *status quo*.
- Cautious Approach in Alienation Suits – In alienation suits, grant injunctions cautiously, assessing if the doctrine of *lis pendens* under Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act offers sufficient protection.
- Demand for Detailed Pleadings – Insist on detailed and specific pleadings from parties claiming possession to discourage vague assertions and facilitate more informed decisions on interim relief.

References:

- C. K. Thakker, 'Code of Civil Procedure, 1908', Eastern Book Company, 2014 Edition.
- Sarkar's Commentary on The Code of Civil Procedure 1908, Sweet and Soft, 9th Edition, 2024.
- Adam Smith, Law and the Invisible Hand, A Theory of Adam Smith Jurisprudance, Cambridge University Press, 1st Edition, 2021.

- Anand and Iyer (2004), The Specific Relief Act, 1963, Delhi Law House, 11th Edition.
- https://www.aironline.in/
- https://digilegal.co.in/
- https://www.scconline.com/blog/post/tag/scc-online-blog/
- https://www.manupatrafast.com/
- https://www.barandbench.com/

[i] Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co., 1995 (5) SCC 545
[ii] Dalpat Kumar v. Prahlad Singh, 1992 (1) SCC 719
[iii] Prakash Singh v. State of Haryana, 2002 (4) Civil L. J. 71 (P & H)
[iv] Harcharanjit Singh Thind v. Diksha Thind, 2008 (3) Mh.L.J. 587
[v] Rekha v. Rambhau, AIR 2007 Bombay 135
[vi] Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund v. Kartick Das, 1994 (4) SCC 225
[vii] Dorab Cawasji Warden v. Coomi Sorab Warden, AIR 1990 SC 867
[viii] Section 52, Transfer of Property Act, 1882
[ix] M/S Kachhi Properties v. All Residents, 2010 (5) Bom.C.R. 43
[x] Percept D'mark (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Zahirkhan, AIR 2006 SC 3426
[xi] Cotton Corporation of India Limited v. United Industrial Bank Limited and Ors., 1983 (4) SCC 625
[xii] Modi Entertainment Network v. WSG Cricket Pte. Ltd., AIR 2003 SC 1177
[xiii] Tayyabhai M. Bagasarwalla v. Hind Rubber Industries, AIR 1997 SC 1240
[xiv] Dalpat Kumar v. Prahlad Singh, AIR 1993 SC 276
[xv] Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co., 1995 (5) SCC 545
[xvi] Morgan Stanley Mutual Fund v. Kartick Das, 1994 (4) SCC 225
[xvii] Dorab Cawasji Warden v. Coomi Sorab Warden, AIR 1990 SC 867
[xviii] Anathula Sudhakar v. P. Buchi Reddy, 2008 (4) SCC 594
[xix] Maria Margarida Sequeria Fernandes v. Erasmo Jack de Sequeria, AIR 2012 SC 1727
[xx] Manohar Lal Chopra v. Rai Bahadur Rao Raja Seth Hira Lal, AIR 1962 SC 527
[xxi] Tayyabhai M. Bagasarwalla v. Hind Rubber Industries, AIR 1997 SC 1240
[xxii] M. Gurudas and Ors. v. Rasaranjan and Ors., AIR 2006 SC 3275