TRADEMARK LITIGATION DIGEST

This Compendium of Trademark Cases presents a consolidated repository of Trademark litigation and appellate proceedings, primarily adjudicated before the Intellectual Property Division (IPD) of the Delhi High Court. Designed as a practical and authoritative reference, it encompasses ongoing, concluded, and landmark decisions that have significantly influenced the interpretation and enforcement of trademark law in India. The compilation covers a broad spectrum of matters, including civil appeals, rectification petitions, and infringement suits, and encapsulates judicial reasoning on key statutory provisions of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 particularly Sections 09, 11, 21, 47, and 57 as well as procedural norms under the Trade Marks Rules, 2017.

INDEX

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of trademark law in India has been significantly shaped by judicial scrutiny of the decisions and actions of the Registrar of Trademarks. With the establishment of the Intellectual Property Division (IPD) of the Delhi High Court and the transfer of cases from the erstwhile Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB), has emerged clarifying procedural nuances, statutory interpretations, and enforcement standards under the Trade Marks Act, 1999. This Compendium of Cases is a record of litigation and appellate proceedings involving the Trade Marks Registry, drawn from judgments and ongoing matters before the Delhi High Court (IPD). It consolidates over 100 cases covering a broad spectrum of legal issues, including:

- Condonation of delay in filing oppositions and appeals
- Abandonment orders and procedural lapses by the Registry
- Rejection of applications under Sections 9 and 11
- Rectification and cancellation petitions under Section 57
- Trademark infringement suits involving third-party rights and Registrar decisions
- Interpretation of statutory provisions, especially Sections 21, 47, and 117A

Through a methodical classification of disposed, pending, and landmark cases, this compendium not only serves as a practical reference for trademark practitioners but also provides insight into the courts' evolving approach to natural justice, procedural rigor, and the limits of the Registrar's discretion.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Through a close analysis of the compiled decisions, the following legal trends and observations emerge:

- **Strict Scrutiny of Registry Actions**: Courts have consistently emphasized that abandonment or refusal orders must adhere to procedural fairness and comply with natural justice. Cases such as *Mars Inc. and Shenzhen Hottech Electronics Co. Ltd.* highlight the importance of proper notice and hearing. *Suparshva Swabs Ltd. v. Registrar of Trademarks* is another example where failure to serve the opposition notice led to revival of the application.

- ***Flexible but Reasoned Approach to Delay:*** In several matters, the Delhi High Court has adopted a balanced approach to condonation of delay, allowing appeals where litigants showed *bona fide* intent (e.g., *V-Guard Industries Ltd. v. Registrar of Trademarks & Anr.*) while declining relief in cases of gross inaction (e.g., *Jagran Prakashan Ltd. v. Registrar of Trademarks.*).

- **Clarification on Jurisdiction and Service:** Disputes over territorial jurisdiction and service of notices remain frequent, with the Court offering guidance on when the clock for statutory deadlines truly begins. In *Pranab Kumar Banerjee v. Registrar of Trademarks*, the issue of territorial jurisdiction was hotly contested between the parties. The matter remains pending, with wider implications on forum selection under the Trade Marks Act. In *Acadian Seaplants Ltd. v. Registrar of Trademarks*, the High Court reaffirmed that limitation under Section 21(2) begins only after actual service of notice, overruling the Registry's abandonment based on presumed timelines.

- **Rectification and Cancellation Actions:** Section 57 petitions for removal of wrongly registered marks have increased, often invoking grounds of non-use or fraudulent assignment. *Mahesh Gupta v. Registrar of Trademarks & Anr.* resulted in cancellation after the respondent admitted non-use and disinterest. In *Manoj Sweets v. Registrar of Trademarks* (C.O. COMM.IPD-TM 794/2022), the Court cancelled the mark "MANOJ BAKERS" owing to conflict with the petitioner's prior mark. Other pending rectification cases such as *Mithaas Sweets & Restaurant Pvt. Ltd. v. Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks* explore issues of non-use and deceptive similarity under Sections 9, 11, 18, 47, and 57.

- **Interpretation of Sections 9 and 11 – Distinctiveness & Deceptiveness:** The Delhi High Court has shown a willingness to reconsider Registry refusals under Sections 9(1)(a) and 11(1) where applicants could establish market use, acquired distinctiveness, or ownership of cited marks. In *Lifestyles Healthcare Pte Ltd v. Registrar of Trademarks*, the Court held that ownership of the cited mark made refusal under Section 11 unsustainable. *SRS Live Technologies Pvt. Ltd. v. Registrar* challenged a refusal for being "devoid of distinctiveness"; the matter was remanded for fresh hearing after procedural objections.

- **Registry's Role in Dispute Resolution**: While the Trade Marks Registry plays an administrative role, courts have increasingly scrutinized its discretionary powers particularly in opposition handling, evidence acceptance, and communication protocols.

- **Rise in Rectification Actions:** The compendium includes numerous petitions seeking removal of marks on grounds of non-use, generic nature, or fraudulent registration. The trend reflects growing enforcement by both legacy and emerging brands.

- **Infringement Litigation Against Imposters:** A noticeable portion of trademark suits involve digital fraud and impersonation, particularly by well-known brands like Verizon, highlighting the increasing relevance of IP protection in the online space. The Verizon series of cases (e.g., *Verizon Trademark Services LLC v. Aerosylt Ventures Pvt. Ltd.*, *Verizon v. Veriezon Hospital*) illustrate aggressive enforcement against imposter entities that exploited Registry data to mimic branding.

CASES INVOLVING CONDONATION OF DELAY

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief		Sta
1	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 10/2025	PTS Diagnostics India. Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademark **Respondent**	The Appellant filed an appeal challenging an order of the Trade Marks Registry. A delay of 21 days in filing the appeal was condoned by the Court. Notice was issued, and the respondent was directed to file a reply within four weeks. The rejoinder, if any, was to be filed within one week thereafter. On 9 May 2025, the Court noted that although documents had been filed, they were under objection.		**Case Pe**
2	C.A.(COMM.IPDTM) 39/2022	M/S V-Guard Industries Ltd **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	In this order, dated January 6, 2023, a Single Judge of the High Court of Delhi allowed an appeal filed by M/S V-Guard Industries Ltd against an order passed by the Registrar of Trade Marks on August 30, 2018. The Registrar had declared the opposition filed by M/S V-Guard Industries Ltd (the Appellant) to a trademark registration as abandoned because of a delay in filing evidence to support their opposition. The High Court, in its judgment, adopted a broader interpretation of the rule regarding the timeline for submitting evidence in opposition to a trademark application, specifically concerning the expression "leaving documents with the Registrar". The court found that in the specific circumstances of the case, the Appellant was entitled to the benefit of an ambiguity in the provision. This decision effectively overturned the Registrar's order and allowed the opposition to proceed.		**Case Di**
3.	W.P.(C)-IPD 4/2022	Dr. Reddys Laboratories Limited **Appellant** *verses*	On March 16, 2022, Justice Prathiba M. Singh of the Delhi High Court addressed the issue of condonation of delay in filing objections to trademark applications in W.P.(C)-IPD 103/2021 and connected matters. The court directed the Registrar of Trademarks & GI to		**Case Di**

		Controller General of Patents Designs and Trademarks **Respondent**	provide information on whether physical or online filing of oppositions were permitted during the pandemic, specifically after the four-month time period, and if so, how many oppositions were entertained [1]. The matter was listed for further hearing on March 21, 2022, with officials from the Registrar of Trademarks expected to be present. In a related matter, W.P.(C)-IPD 4/2022, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited's case was re-notified for July 21, 2025, to allow the petitioner to review the report received from the Trade Marks Registry.		

CASES INVOLVING APPEALS UNDER SECTION 91 & 117A

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 11/2025	Acadian Sea plants Limited **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks, Delhi & Anr. **Respondent**	This appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, was filed against an order by the Trade Marks Registry deeming the appellant's application as abandoned. The Registry held that the counter statement, required under Section 21(2), was filed beyond the prescribed time and that the affidavit filed contained a false statement. The appellant argued that the date error in the affidavit was a typographical mistake and that the notice of opposition had never been served. Citing Mars Inc. v. Registrar of Trademarks, the Delhi High Court held that the limitation period under Section 21(2) begins only upon actual service of the opposition notice. Finding no evidence of such service, the Court set aside the impugned order, directed the counter statement filed on to be taken on record, and allowed the opposition to proceed on merits.	**Case Disposed**
2.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 12/2025	Yiwu Kemei Electric Appliance Co. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks and Anr & Anr. **Respondent**	The appellant filed an appeal challenging an order of the Trade Marks Registry, along with an application seeking condonation of a 62-day delay in filing. The Court condoned the delay and issued notice. Respondent No. 1 opted not to file a response, while Respondent No. 2 was granted three weeks to file a reply, with rejoinder due within two weeks thereafter.	**Case Pending**

3.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 25/2025	Harpal Singh Gulati **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the order dated 20 February 2025 passed by the Trade Marks Registry rejecting his trademark application. The Delhi High Court admitted the appeal and issued notice to the Registrar of Trademarks. The respondent was directed to file written submissions within six weeks, with three weeks thereafter for the appellant's rejoinder.	**Case Pending**
4.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 14/2024	Pranab Kumar Banerjee **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 against the refusal of trademark registration for the mark "ESTB 2020 THE BIRYANI DEPOT – A FEDERAL COLLECTION" by the Registrar of Trademarks, Mumbai. At the outset, the issue of territorial jurisdiction was raised, as both the order and the appellant are based in Maharashtra. While the appellant cited statutory provisions and past Delhi High Court orders to support jurisdiction, the respondent relied on the Trade Marks Rules to contest it. The matter has since been adjourned multiple times, pending a decision by a larger bench on territorial jurisdiction.	**Case Pending**
5.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 24/2024	Lifestyles Healthcare Pte Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 read with Rule 156 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, challenging the Registrar's refusal to register the mark 'SKYN', citing conflict with an already existing mark. The appellant argued that the cited mark also belonged to them and had been duly assigned through executed deeds. Multiple existing registrations of the 'SKYN' mark across other classes were also cited in their favour. As the cited mark was assigned to the appellant, it could not constitute a bar to registration. Taking into account the assignments, prior registrations, and absence of rebuttal from the respondent, the Court set aside the refusal order dated 9 January 2024 and remanded the matter back to the Registrar for fresh consideration of the application in accordance with law.	**Case Pending**
6.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 32/2024	Sunflame Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. **Appellate** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	Sunflame Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the rejecting Sunflame's opposition to a trademark application filed by Respondent No. 2 for a mark in Class 11. The appellant argued that the Registrar applied the wrong legal test by requiring proof of actual confusion, instead of assessing the likelihood of	**Case Pending**

			confusion or association between the marks, which is the correct standard in trademark law. The Court issued notice, and the parties were directed to file written submissions. A delay in filing the reply by Respondent No. 2 was condoned subject to a cost of ₹8,000. The Registrar was also directed to file an affidavit clarifying the designation and employment status of the officer who passed the impugned order. On 26 March 2025, the parties informed the Court that they are exploring a settlement.	
7.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 34/2024	SRS Live Technologies Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, SRS Live Technologies Pvt. Ltd., filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 against the order passed by the Senior Examiner of Trade Marks, which rejected trademark application for the mark "SabPaisa" under Section 9(1)(a) of the Act for being devoid of distinctiveness. At the initial hearing, the Court issued notice and recorded the appellant's contention that the appeal was filed within the limitation period, despite objections raised and later removed. The respondent's counsel contested this, arguing the appeal was time-barred. Both parties were directed to file written submissions. The respondent later sought more time and requested a copy of the appeal paper book. The Court granted a final opportunity to file a reply.	**Case Pending**
8.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 41/2024	Sujan Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the refusal of its trademark application for a mark in Class 25 under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. The refusal was based on Section 11 grounds, despite the appellant having secured a letter of consent from the proprietor of the cited mark. The Court noted that the appellant already held registrations for the same mark in Classes 28 and 41, and the sister company had consented to the application in Class 25. Finding merit in the appeal, the Court set aside the refusal order and directed the appellant to submit a representation to the Registrar. The Registrar was instructed to take necessary steps accordingly.	**Case Disposed**
9.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 48/2024	Haveli Restaurant & Resorts Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Ors **Respondent**	Appellant had filed one case to challenge two trademark orders. Later, they informed the Court that this was a mistake and asked for permission to withdraw the case so they could file two separate cases instead. The Court allowed this request and dismissed the current case as withdrawn.	**Case Disposed**

10.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 50/2024	Shenzhen Hottech Electronics Co. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Appellant filed an appeal after its trademark application for the mark "H HOTTECH (Device)" under Class 9 was rejected. The company argued that it never received notice of the hearing, which prevented them from presenting their case. The Court noted this was a violation of the principles of natural justice and set aside the rejection order. The matter was sent back to the Registrar of Trademarks, with directions to issue a fresh hearing notice and ensure a fair hearing before a different officer.	**Case Disposed**
11.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 57/2024 & 58/2024	Haveli Restaurant and Resorts Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	The appellant challenged two orders related to their trademark applications. The court initially directed the Trademark Registry to submit relevant documents, which were received but not yet scanned. The Registry was asked to scan and share them, and parties were instructed to file written submissions. Respondent no. 2 accused the appellant of submitting forged VAT bills predating the implementation of VAT in 2005 and sought an inquiry under the BNSS. The Court issued notice and allowed the appellant time to respond.	**Case Pending**
12.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 61/2024	Maharishi University of Information Technology **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademark **Respondent**	Under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 read with Rule 156 of the Trade Marks Rules, appellant filed an appeal challenging the refusal of its trademark application (No. 5086229) under Section 11. The Registrar had refused the mark on the grounds of similarity with an existing trademark. Along with the appeal, the appellant filed applications seeking exemption from filing clear annexures and condonation of a 12-day delay in refiling. Both applications were allowed. The Court directed the appellant to serve a complete copy of the appeal to the respondent and granted both parties time to file written submissions.	**Case Pending**
13.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 77/2024	M/s Suparsh va Swabs I Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The appellant filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the order passed by the Registrar of Trademarks, which deemed their application for the word mark "NATURE WORKS" in Class 16) abandoned under Section 21(2) of the Act. The appellant argued that it never received the notice of opposition and, therefore, could not file a counter statement. The Registrar admitted that the email service of the notice had bounced and no acknowledgement from the appellant was on record. Observing that the non-filing of the counter statement resulted from non-service of the notice, the Court set aside the impugned	**Case Disposed**

			order, revived the application, and directed the Registrar to re-serve the notice of opposition and allow the appellant to file its counter statement in accordance with law.	
14.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 81/2024	Spaceman Spirits Lab Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the order dated passed by the Trademark Registry rejecting Application for the mark "Sitara Rum from India." The appellant submitted that the impugned order was passed without affording an oral hearing, as counsel could not appear due to personal reasons. The Registry admitted that no oral hearing took place and that the order was based solely on the written response to the examination report. It was also noted that the appellant had not filed Form TM-A for extension of time. The Court, without entering into the merits, set aside the order and remanded the matter for a fresh decision after granting an opportunity of hearing to the appellant.	**Case Disposed**
15.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 82/2024	Ms. Monica Chadda **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the removal of her trademark 'PAR CENTUARY' from the Register via an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. She contended that the removal was unjustified. The Court allowed both parties to file additional documents and took note of procedural delays, which were condoned. A related suit (CS(COMM) 393/2021) was sought to be consolidated. With pleadings complete and rejoinders on record, the appeal and applications were Case Disposed of, with the next hearing listed for September 2025.	**Case Pending**
16.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 83/2024	Shyam Lal Arora **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the order passed by the Assistant Registrar of Trademarks allowing the registration of the impugned mark, despite the appellant's opposition claiming prior use of the mark "SHEETAL"/"SHEETAL COSMETIC". It was argued that the Registry failed to consider the appellant's copyright claims and prior use since the early 1990s. The respondent admitted to knowing the appellant's business since 1995 and cited honest concurrent use but failed to produce substantive documents before the Registry. A related civil suit is already pending before the Tis Hazari Court, and an earlier Division Bench order permitted limited use of the mark by the respondent. The Court took note of these facts and directed both parties to complete pleadings.	**Case Pending**

			Subsequently, the delay of 81 days in filing reply by the respondent was condoned with costs of ₹10,000. Written synopses with relevant dates and legal propositions were also directed to be filed.	
17.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 88/2024	Mars Incorporated Appellant *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	Mars Incorporated filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trademarks Act challenging the Deputy Registrar's order upholding abandonment of its trademark and rejecting a review petition. The Court granted time to submit required documents under Section 63(4)(c) of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam and issued notice to respondents. Replies and rejoinders were directed within set timelines	**Case Disposed**
18.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 89/2024	Impresario Entertainment and Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the Registrar's refusal to register its trademark (Application No. 5596291) under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act. Impresario argued that the mark, which also forms part of its trade name, holds substantial commercial value. The Court issued notice and fixed timelines for reply and rejoinder. On 17 April 2025, the respondent opted not to file a reply and was granted four weeks to submit a written synopsis. The matter is next listed for 7 August 2025.	**Case Pending**
19.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 83/2024	Raj Kumar Jain **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed an appeal challenging a trademark order. The matter is connected to CS(COMM) 379/2022, a suit involving the same parties. Due to the Presiding Officer being on leave across multiple dates in November 2024, hearings were deferred. On 3 December 2024, the Court condoned a short delay in filing and re-filing the rejoinder and directed it to be taken on record. The Court later noted that CS(COMM) 379/2022 was wrongly reflected as disposed of and directed the Registry to correct the record.	**Case Disposed**
20.	LPA 57/2024	Mehboob Ahmad – **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. – **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the order of the Single Judge, which rejected his application seeking clarification of a prior order. The Single Judge had earlier allowed the respondent's appeal against the refusal of a trademark registration for a device mark and directed the Registrar to consider additional material and proceed to issue a registration certificate. The appellant argued that the Registrar should have been directed to advertise the mark, not register it directly. However, the Division Bench held that the order was clear and unambiguous, and the appellant's remedy, if	**Dismissed**

			any, lay in challenging that original order. The appeal was dismissed, with liberty to pursue appropriate remedies against the original order.	
21	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 31/2023	Jetharam Nemaram Gehlot **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The appellant, Jetharam Nemaram Gehlot, challenged an order dated 13.08.2024 passed by the Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs, and Trademarks. During the hearing on 20.03.2025, the Registrar of Trademarks sought time to obtain instructions regarding the said order. The Court directed the matter to be listed again on 25.04.2025 and took on record documents submitted by the appellant. On 25.04.2025, the counsel for the Registrar (Respondent No. 1) was granted four weeks to comply with the earlier directions of the Court. The matter was renotified for 28.07.2025 for further proceedings.	**Case Pending**
22	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 33/2023	Kalsi Metal Works Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	Kalsi Metal Works Pvt. Ltd. filed an appeal challenging the rejection of its trademark application. The Court granted Respondent No. 2 (opposing party) time to file a reply but later noted that both parties agreed to rely on existing submissions made before the Trademark Registry. No further pleadings were required.	**Case Pending**
23	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 36/2023	M/s Raj Abhushan Bhandar **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar, Trademark & Anr. **Respondent**	Appellate filed an appeal challenging an order of the Deputy Registrar of Trademarks in a trademark dispute. The case was admitted after condonation of a 145-day delay in re-filing, and exemption was granted from pre-institution mediation. Notices were issued to the respondents, who subsequently sought time to file their replies. Respondent No. 2's reply was delayed by 65 days, for which a condonation application was filed and eventually allowed with costs. Rejoinders and written submissions are pending.	**Case Pending**
24	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 37/2023	Mr. Rashmin M. Majithia **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	Mr. Rashmin M. Majithia filed this appeal against the order of the Deputy Registrar of Trademarks concerning a dispute over trademark rights. The appeal was accompanied by applications seeking exemption, stay of the impugned order, and condonation of a 21-day delay in refiling, which the Court allowed. Initial hearings were adjourned due to the court not sitting. The case was formally admitted on 5 January 2024 and notice was issued to the respondents. During proceedings, it was brought to the Court's notice that the ownership of the trademark had changed, with the original partnership now converted into DS Intellectual Properties LLP. Respondent No. 2 filed their reply with a delay of 48 days, which was	**Case pending**

			condoned with costs. The appellant also filed a delayed rejoinder, which was accepted upon payment of ₹1000 as costs to the court clerk association. The matter is currently pending.	
25	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 8/2023	Navaid Khan **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks Office **Respondent**	The appellant, Mr. Navaid Khan, filed this appeal challenging the order dated 12 January 2023 passed by the Registrar of Trademarks, which refused the registration of his trademark "CRUZOIL" (device mark) in Class 4. The Delhi High Court admitted the appeal, granted exemption from filing original documents for the time being, and issued notice to the respondent. The Court directed the respondent to file a reply within four weeks, with the rejoinder to follow.	**Case Disposed**
26	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 9/2023	M/s Abbott GmbH **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. – **Respondent**	Appellant filed this appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the order dated rejecting its opposition to the registration of the mark "MEBUFEN". The Delhi High Court admitted the matter and issued notice to both respondents. Multiple opportunities were granted for filing replies and rejoinders, with Respondent No. 2's delayed reply eventually taken on record subject to costs. The appellant's rejoinder was also filed late and accepted upon payment of costs. Pleadings were completed, and final arguments were heard. The matter now stands reserved for judgment.	**Case Disposed**
27	FAO 151/2021 & FAO 150/2021	Kent RO Systems Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	Kent RO Systems Ltd. filed a First Appeal (FAO 151/2021) before the Delhi High Court challenging an order by the Deputy Registrar of Trademarks. The Court issued notice to the respondents notice was accepted by counsel for Respondent No. 2, and also directed to be served to Respondent No. 1 through standing counsel. The Court requisitioned the digital copy of the Registry's record. It was noted that Annexure B in the appellant's paper book was illegible in parts. Kent RO was directed to replace the defective annexure with a legible version and supply a digital copy to Respondent No. 2's counsel.	**Disposed**

28	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 81/2021	Topstorm Apparels Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Topstorm Apparels Pvt. Ltd. filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 against the refusal of their trademark registration. The application was rejected on the ground that two earlier marks were identical or deceptively similar. Of these, one cited mark had expired in 1984, and the other – registered for "QUILL FORM" – was for innerwear, which was considered allied or cognate goods. At the hearing on 18 August 2023, the appellant sought time to cite supporting judgments. However, on 21 August 2023, the appellant's counsel informed the Court that the appeal was not being pressed, as the client intended to adopt a different mark. Consequently, the appeal was Case Disposed of as not pressed.	**Case Disposed**
29	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 93/2021	Innovexia Life Science Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed an appeal challenging the order issued by the Registrar of Trademarks, which had refused registration of the mark "FEVASAFE" under Class 5. The refusal was based on cited similarity with a prior mark "FIVSAFE" and objections under Sections 9 and 11 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. No one appeared on behalf of the applicant during the hearing before the Trademark Office, nor was any adjournment sought. The appeal was later filed before the IP Division of the Delhi High Court but was found to be lacking in substance and merely argued phonetic dissimilarity. Despite service of notice, neither the appellant nor their counsel appeared during proceedings. The Court noted that the appellant had shifted from its listed address and had failed to prosecute the matter diligently. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed for non-prosecution by Justice Prathiba M. Singh on 06.09.2023.	**Case Disposed**
30	CA (COMM IPD-TM) 8/2021	News Nation Networks Private Limited **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	This appeal was filed by News Nation Networks Pvt. Ltd. challenging an order of the Registrar of Trademarks, likely concerning the refusal or procedural handling of a trademark application. The matter has seen multiple adjournments	**Case Disposed**
31	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 70/2021	Jagran Prakashan Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 seeking to challenge the abandonment of its trademark application by the Registrar of Trademarks via an Order. The application had been deemed abandoned under Rule 38(5) of the Trade Marks Rules, 2002 due to non-response to the Examination Report. The appellant claimed it	**Case Disposed**

			became aware of the abandonment only in 2020 upon receiving a reply to a cease and desist notice from a third party using a similar mark. There was a delay of 1506 days in filing the appeal, for which condonation was sought. The Court, however, held that the appellant had adequate notice through communications dispatched on record and found the explanation for the delay unconvincing. The application for condonation of delay was dismissed, and consequently, the appeal itself was also dismissed.	
32	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 64/2021	Ashok Kumar Goyal **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed an appeal challenging an order by the Registrar of Trademarks. However, despite being served notice for multiple hearing dates, the appellant failed to appear or pursue the matter. Consequently, the Court dismissed the appeal for default and non-prosecution on 02.05.2023. The matter stands disposed of.	**Case Disposed**
33	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 50/2021	Pacific Telescope Corp. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appeal was filed by Pacific Telescope Corp. challenging an order passed by the Registrar of Trademarks, concerning objections to the registration or maintenance of their trademark. The case was earlier pending before the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB), and upon its abolition, it was transferred to the Delhi High Court. Initially, directions were given to both parties to coordinate with the Registry and remove any procedural objections within four weeks. A fresh report on remaining deficiencies was sought. As per the order, the appellant had complied with all formalities and the respondent had been served with notice earlier.	**Case Disposed**
34	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 48/2021	Colorbar Cosmetics Pvt L Td **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed this appeal against the Registrar of Trademarks following the abolition of the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB). The matter concerned objections related to a pending appeal transferred to the High Court. However, the appellant later submitted that the issues raised had already been decided in CA (COMM. IPD-TM.) 3/2021 by orders dated 8 November 2021 and 25 March 2022. In view of the earlier rulings covering the same subject matter, the Delhi High Court, disposed of the present appeal as infructuous.	**Case Disposed**
35	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 45/2021	STP Limited **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks	STP Limited filed a batch of appeals under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging orders passed by the Registrar of Trademarks rejecting its trademark applications. During the course of proceedings,	**Case Disposed**

		Respondent	the respondents (Trademark Registry) sought time to file their written submissions, citing late receipt of the amended appeals. The Court granted time for submissions and listed the matter for final hearing.	
36	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 37/2021	Roopaks Pik and Pay **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed this appeal challenging the refusal of its trademark application. The matter pertains to the use and registration of the subject mark, and the appellant sought to place on record relevant orders of the court to substantiate its claim of prior use. During the proceedings on the Joint Registrar granted six weeks' time for the appellant to file an affidavit regarding earlier orders passed by the erstwhile IPAB. On the next listed date counsel for the appellant again sought more time to place on record supportive court orders. The matter was accordingly adjourned.	**Case Disposed**
37	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 36/2021	Dalmia Infrastructure Pvt Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	This appeal was filed by Dalmia Infrastructure Pvt Ltd before the Delhi High Court, following the transfer of proceedings from the erstwhile Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) pursuant to the Tribunal Reforms Act, 2021. After the transfer, no representation was made on behalf of the appellant. Court notices were returned unserved, with the appellant's premises found locked and no alternative contact information available. The law firm Obhan and Associates, originally representing the appellant, confirmed they no longer acted in the matter. Due to repeated failed attempts to reach the appellant and the absence of any subsequent representation or prosecution, the Court dismissed the appeal for non-prosecution	**Case Disposed**
38	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 35/2021	SRL Limited **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	SRL Limited filed an appeal before the Delhi High Court against the Registrar of Trademarks. The matter was initially listed before the Joint Registrar (Judicial), who noted that an affidavit regarding earlier IPAB orders was pending and directed that registry objections be addressed and a fresh report be filed. Subsequently, the appellant's counsel submitted that he had instructions to withdraw the appeal. Accordingly, the matter was dismissed as withdrawn	**Case Disposed**

39	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 3/2021	Colorbar Cosmetics Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Colorbar appealed the rejection of its trademark application for the logo, which was denied due to alleged similarity with a registered "CB" mark. The court found no deceptive similarity and allowed the appeal, directing the Registrar to process the application. Upon non-compliance, Colorbar sought enforcement, and the court ordered the mark's advertisement and timely registration if unopposed. Matter disposed.	**Case Disposed**
40	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 138/2021	Maharshi Patanjali Vidya Mandir Samiti **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	This case was filed by Maharshi Patanjali Vidya Mandir Samiti against the Registrar of Trademarks, challenging issues related to their trademark application. The matter has faced delays due to procedural lapses, including lack of representation by both parties and pending service reports. None appeared for either party, prompting the Joint Registrar to issue fresh court notices and relist the matter. Subsequently, the Joint Registrar noted continued procedural deficiencies and directed both parties to coordinate with the Registry to resolve all objections within four weeks.	**Case Disposed**
41.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 137/2021	Dalmia Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., now known as Dalmia Consolidated Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks Respondent	This case was filed by Dalmia Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. challenging an order or action by the Registrar of Trademarks. However, the proceedings stalled due to repeated non-appearance by the appellant. Initially, counsel for the appellant was served but failed to appear. A subsequent court notice issued directly to the appellant remained unserved, with a report indicating that no one was found at the given address and no alternate address was available. Due to these procedural lapses and lack of prosecution, the Delhi High Court dismissed the case	**Case Disposed**
42.	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 136/2021	Sana Herbals Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademark & Ors. **Respondent**	Sana Herbals Pvt. Ltd. filed an appeal challenging the order passed by the Registrar of Trademarks, which dismissed their opposition against trademark application filed by Respondents 2 and 3 for the mark "NOKUF." The appellant argued that the mark was deceptively similar to their own. During the proceedings, it was revealed that the appellant had already filed a rectification petition in 2020 seeking cancellation of the same mark, and this petition was still pending before the Trademark Registry. Given this, the Delhi High Court disposed of the appeal, granting the appellant liberty to raise all relevant grounds in the pending rectification petition. No findings were made on merits.	**Case Disposed**

43.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 24/2021	Ebay, Inc. **Appellant** *verses* The Controller General of Patents Designs and Trademarks **Respondent**	The present appeal was filed by eBay, Inc. against the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks. However, during the hearing on 20 May 2022 before the Delhi High Court, counsel for the appellant sought permission to withdraw the appeal. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed as withdrawn. No adjudication on merits took place.	**Case Disposed**
44.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 103/2021	Ram Prakash Mittal and Anr. **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks and Others **Respondent**	This appeal was filed by Ram Prakash Mittal and another against the Registrar of Trademarks and others. The dispute stems from a family conflict that has implications on trademark ownership and is presently under arbitration. The Delhi High Court has acknowledged that the matter is sub judice before the learned Arbitrator. Accordingly, the case has been adjourned multiple times, directing that the matter be re-notified on 2 September 2025. Interim orders, if any, will remain in force till then. The core issue relates to a family dispute affecting trademark rights, and the High Court is awaiting resolution through arbitration proceedings.	**Pending**
45.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 11/2021 & C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 12/2021	Ian Macleod Distillers India Pvt Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	Ian Macleod Distillers India Pvt. Ltd. filed two appeals against the orders of the Registrar of Trademarks rejecting the registration of their word/device mark "INDIAN STAG". However, in a connected civil suit—CS(COMM) 371/2019—filed by Pernod Ricard India Pvt. Ltd., the Delhi High Court had already granted an interim injunction on 31st October 2023, restraining Ian Macleod from using the said mark. Citing this, the proposed respondent contended that the appeals were not maintainable. The appellants' counsel initially sought time to obtain instructions regarding the mark. However, on the next date of hearing, the counsel informed the Court that the appellants wished to withdraw both appeals. Consequently, the Court dismissed both appeals as withdrawn and disposed of pending applications as infructuous.	**Case Disposed**
46.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 8/2022 & C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 9/2022	Modicare Limited **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	This case involves an appeal filed by Modicare Limited under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. The appeal challenges the order passed by the Registrar of Trademarks, which rejected Modicare's application for registration of the trademark "SALON PROFESSIONAL". The respondent, represented by the CGSC, accepted the notice. The respondent was	**Case Disposed**

			directed to file a reply within six weeks, and the matter was listed along with connected cases on 4 April 2022.	
47.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 46/2024	Imagine Pharma **Appellant** *verses* Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant challenged an order passed by the Patent Office and filed an appeal under the provisions governing commercial intellectual property disputes. Notice was issued on 18 July 2024, and the respondent was granted time to file a reply. Despite prior extensions, on 27 November 2024, the respondent sought further time, which was granted as a last opportunity. On 26 March 2025, the Court again allowed four weeks for the respondent to file reply/written submissions, warning that failure to do so would forfeit that right. The appellant was allowed to file rejoinder/written submissions within six weeks thereafter.	**Case Pending**
48.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 465/2022	Emitec Gesellschaftfur Emissions Technologie Mbh **Appellant** *verses* Controller General Of Patents, Designs &Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	On March 24, 2025, The appellant's attorney contended that the Controller's order referenced six previous art papers, but it did not specify which combination made the invention clear or how they addressed the patent application. The attorney asked that the case be remanded for additional review. The case has been scheduled for May 20, 2025, and the court has instructed the Controller to participate by video conference. Due to the Honourable Judge's attendance at the INTA Annual Conference, the case was postponed until August 11, 2025, on May 20, 2025.	**Case Pending**
49.	C.A.(COMM.IPDPAT) 475/2022	Ethicon LLC, **Appellant** *verses* The Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks and Anr **Respondent**	The High Court of Delhi's Joint Registrar (Judicial), Surya Malik Grover (DHJS), gave the order on September 6, 2022. After being abolished by the Tribunals Reforms (Regulation and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021, the case was received from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB). Since no order sheets from the IPAB were on file, the register was instructed to alert the parties about the shortcomings. The registry also voiced concerns about the order sheets that were missing. On November 10, 2022, the matter was listed before the Hon'ble Court for further guidance after the court ordered that the faults be fixed and that the registry file a new report. Ethicon	**Case Pending**

			LLC's patent application, *"A method of coating a medical device and a medical device obtained therefrom"* was denied by the Patent Office due to a lack of inventive step. The respondents received notice from the High Court. Within eight weeks, both the respondent and the appellant were allowed to submit written arguments. The hearing date for the case was set on February 8, 2023. The appellant did not object to the adjournment slip that the respondents circulated. Written submissions from the appellant were already in the file. The respondents were given a final six-week window by the court to submit their written arguments and any judicial authorities they wanted to use. On May 1, 2023, the subject was scheduled for hearing and resolution, which was later re-notified for hearing and disposal on July 3, 2025.	
50.	C.A. (COMM.IPDTM) 37/2022	Akhil Chandra S-227, Pancasila Park New Delhi-110017 **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	On February 9, 2022, Joint Registrar (Judicial) Ms. Surya Malik Grover of the Delhi High Court heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 36/2022, which had been transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its abolition. The court noted deficiencies in the file and directed the petitioner to rectify them as per the office report. Court notices were ordered to be issued to both parties and their counsels, along with a note of the defects, with directions to contact the Registry for rectification. The matter was then listed for further proceedings on June 3, 2022. Subsequently, on April 17, 2023 (corrected and released on April 24, 2023), Justice Sanjeev Narula allowed the appeal filed by S&P Global Inc. under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the refusal order dated December 28, 2018, for their multi-class trademark application "Essential Intelligence" (Classes 09, 16, 35, 36, 40, and 41). The refusal was based on the mark being considered laudatory, descriptive, and generic. The court found the refusal orders to be devoid of merit and set them aside. The Trade Marks Registry was directed to process the registration application for the subject mark and advertise it within three months. Any future opposition would be decided on its own merits. The court clarified that the appellant's rights in the mark would be restricted to the combination of words "Essential" and "Intelligence" with no	**Case Disposed**

			exclusive rights to either word separately. This disclaimer was to be reflected in the Trade Marks Journal during advertisement and if the mark proceeds to registration. The appeal was disposed of with these directions.	
51.	C.A. (COMM.IPDTM) 42/2022	Vardhman Holdings Limited **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appeal, filed by Vardhman Holdings Limited under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenged the Senior Examiner's order from January 8, 2019, which had refused the trademark application number 2725139 for "VARDHMAN GROUP" in Class 06 for steel and steel alloys. The refusal was based on Sections 9 (lack of distinctiveness) and 11 (conflicting marks) of the Act. Vardhman Holdings Limited argued that "Vardhman" and its formative marks were already registered across various classes, and the subject mark had been in use since 1988, with an identical mark already registered under Classes 23, 24, and 25. Therefore, the objection under Section 9 regarding lack of distinctiveness was not applicable. Regarding the Section 11 objection, the cited conflicting marks included two belonging to Vardhman Textiles Limited (application numbers 1642133 and 1651291), a sister concern of the Appellant, which had no objection to the registration and could provide a certificate to that effect. The third cited mark (application number 2295933) had been abandoned following an opposition filed by the Appellant. The High Court of Delhi, after considering the arguments, allowed the appeal and set aside the impugned order of January 8, 2017. The Appellant was directed to submit a no-objection certificate or affidavit from Vardhman Textiles Limited for the cited marks (application numbers 1642133 and 1651291) within two weeks. Subject to this compliance, the Trade Marks Registry was instructed to process the registration application for "VARDHMAN GROUP" and advertise it within three months of receiving the no-objection certificate. The court also clarified that the registration would not grant any exclusive rights to the word 'GROUP' separately or individually, and this disclaimer must be reflected in the Trade Marks Journal during advertisement and upon	**Case Disposed**

			registration. The appeal was disposed of with these directions.	

SECTION 57 RECTIFICATION OR CANCELLATION OF TRADEMARK

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 28/2025	AJP Impex Private Limited – **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademark Delhi & Anr. – **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a rectification petition under S. 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, seeking removal of the mark "M FOLD", registered in favour of respondent no. 2. It was argued that "M FOLD" is a generic and descriptive term for multi-fold tissue paper, commonly used in the trade, and its registration violates Sections 9(1)(a), (b), (c) and 17(2)(b) of the Act. The petitioner claimed that its product listings using "M FOLD" along with its own registered mark "ELLA" were removed from Amazon due to the respondent's registration. The Court found a *prima facie* case in favour of the petitioner and stayed the effect of the impugned registration.	**Case Pending**
2.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 33/2025	Guangzhou Hodm Professionals Cosmetics Co Ltd. – **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. – **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a rectification petition under Section 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, seeking removal of the mark "PRO TECHS" from the register, alleging that it was fraudulently assigned to respondent no. 2 on the basis of a forged deed dated 03.02.2022. The Court issued notice and granted time for filing of replies. However, respondent no. 2 could not be served, with postal records indicating that they had shifted abroad. The petitioner informed the Court that efforts were underway to obtain respondent no. 2's updated details through their trademark agent.	**Case Pending**
3.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 67/2025	Epikindifi Software and Solutions Pty Ltd **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Epikindifi Software and Solutions Pvt. Ltd. filed rectification petitions under Section 57 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, seeking removal of the marks "LEND.EZEE" which were wrongly registered in the name of Epikindifi Software and Solutions Pty Ltd. The High Court noted that the Registry had incorrectly listed the Australian entity (Pty Ltd) as the petitioner instead of the Indian company (Pvt. Ltd) and directed the correction of the Memo of Parties within one week. Notices were issued, and the registered proprietor was granted time to file replies within 30 days.	**Case Pending**

4.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 10/2025 & Related Matters	Mithaas Sweets and Restaurant Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed three rectification petitions under Sections 9, 11, 18, 47, and 57 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 challenging trademark registrations. It was submitted that the marks were not used continuously for five years prior to filing, attracting Section 47(1)(a) and (b) on non-use. On 27 January 2025, the Court issued notice. Time was granted to file replies and rejoinders. On 21 April 2025, further directions were issued: respondent no.4 sought time to obtain instructions on appearing for respondents 2 and 3; the petitioner was directed to serve missing documents and initiate fresh notice where needed. All parties were also granted six weeks to file written synopses and key case law.	**Case Pending**
5.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 254/2024 & C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 255/2024	Ms. Drools Pet Food Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed two cancellation petitions under Section 57 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, seeking removal of the mark "TICK & FLEA" registered under Classes 3 and 5. Notices were issued to both respondents, with Respondent No. 2 also being served through counsel from the connected civil suit (CS(COMM) 577/2024). While the Trademark Registry (R-1) chose not to file a reply, R-2 was permitted to do so, but pointed out no explicit court direction required it. Subsequent hearings noted that mediation was ongoing. The Court directed respondents to file replies within six weeks, and rejoinders within three weeks thereafter. The matter is now listed for completion of pleadings on 8 July 2025 and for hearing on 15 September 2025.	**Case Pending**
6.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 195/2021	Mahesh Gupta **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, Mahesh Gupta, filed the present rectification petition seeking cancellation of trademark registration granted to Respondent No. 2. During proceedings, Respondent No. 2 voluntarily stated that he had ceased use of the impugned mark, had no intention to continue using it, and had no objection to its cancellation. He further confirmed that he would not pursue his separate application for a similar mark. Based on this, the Court allowed the petition and directed the Registrar of Trademarks to cancel the impugned mark from the Register. There was no order as to costs. The matter stands disposed of.	**Case Disposed**

7.	C.O. (COMM. IPD-TM) 2/2021	Kia Wang Appellant *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, Kia Wang, filed this rectification petition under Section 57 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, seeking removal of Trademark No. 1572405 from the register. The mark in question, registered by the respondent, was challenged on the grounds that it was wrongly remaining on the register and had been registered without any bona fide intention to use. Kia Wang claimed prior and continuous use of the mark "KAI WANG" and alleged that the impugned mark was deceptively similar, causing confusion in the trade. During the proceedings, the petitioner was allowed to place on record relevant documents and affidavits. The respondent did not object to their inclusion. Both parties filed written submissions	**Case Disposed**
8.	W.P.(C)-IPD 12/2025	Yashoda Hospital and Research Centre Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a writ petition seeking a direction to the Registrar of Trademarks to correct the status of its trademark application from 'Removed' to 'Registered'. The Court issued notice on 5 March 2025. By the next hearing on 15 May 2025, the Registrar had updated the status to 'Rectification filed', which satisfied the petitioner's grievance. As a result, the petition was Case Disposed of as infructuous.	**Case Disposed**
9.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 86/2024 and C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 91/2024	Rajiv Kumar Jain **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	This trademark cancellation petition is connected with CS(COMM) 605/2023, a related suit between the petitioner and respondent no. 2. The matter has been repeatedly adjourned to align with the hearings in the connected suit. It was initially listed before HMJ Mini Pushkarna and adjourned multiple times—first for hearing along with the connected suit, then due to part-heard matters or counsel's unavailability. On the petitioner's request, the case was last re-notified for 24 April 2025.	**Case Pending**
10.	C.A.(COMM. IPDTM) 157/2022	Kusum Electricals Prop Ram Karan Yadav **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar Trademark & Anr **Respondent**	On November 29, 2022, Justice Sanjeev Narula of the Delhi High Court heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 157/2022, an appeal by Kusum Electricals Prop Ram Karan Yadav against the Deputy Registrar Trademark and another. The court granted exemption from filing originals and extended time for court fees. Notice was issued to the respondents, who accepted it. The appellant's counsel was directed to provide a correct paper-book copy to Respondent No. 2's counsel. Replies/written submissions were to be filed within two weeks, with rejoinders within one week thereafter.	**Case Disposed**

			Parties were also directed to file a brief note of submissions with relevant case law. Crucially, the impugned order dated November 9, 2022, was stayed until the next hearing, and the matter was re-notified for December 23, 2022. Subsequently, on May 15, 2025, Justice Amit Bansal addressed the same appeal, which sought to set aside the Deputy Registrar of Trademarks' order dated November 9, 2022. This order had allowed a rectification petition filed by Respondent No. 2, leading to the removal of the appellant's mark "STARMODI" from the Registry. The court noted that the appellant's right to file a counter statement and counter evidence in the opposition had already been closed, and no fresh opportunity would be provided for this. The appeal was disposed of with these terms, and the Registry was directed to supply a copy of the order to the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks of India for compliance. The court explicitly stated that it had not examined the merits of the matter, and the Deputy Registrar should decide the matter independently, and that this order was specific to the peculiar facts of this case and should not be treated as a precedent.	
11.	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 301/2022	Mr. Nadir Rizvi, S/O Mohd. Ahmed Rizvi M/S. Amroha Mehndi Udhyog- **Appellant** *verses* Rafiq Ahmed M/S. Special Ruquayya Hina Zulfi and the Registrar of Trademarks- **Respondent**	On August 16, 2024, the High Court of Delhi dismissed rectification petitions C.O.301/2022 and C.O.469/2022, filed by Mr. Nadir Rizvi (M/s. Amroha Mehndi Udhyog) against Rafiq Ahmed (M/s. Special Ruquayya Hina Zulfi and M/s Shahji General Store) and The Registrar of Trademarks. The petitions sought removal of the trademark 'HINA ZULFI' (registration nos. 2496714 and 2559357 in Class 03) from the Register of Trade Marks under Sections 47 and 57 of the Trademarks Act, 1999. The court noted that a suit (No. 1/2016) filed by the respondent is pending in District Court, Jyotiba Phule Nagar, Amroha, and a suit (No. 01/2013) filed by the petitioner was dismissed on April 22, 2022. The respondent's counsel objected to the maintainability of the rectification petitions, arguing that the petitioner had not sought leave of the Court under Section 124(1)(ii) of the Trademarks Act, 1999. The court, presided over by Hon'ble Ms. Justice Mini Pushkarna, reiterated that Section 124 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, outlines the procedure to be followed in cases where the	**Case Disposed**

			validity of a trademark's registration is questioned in an infringement suit. This procedure requires the defendant to plead the invalidity of the plaintiff's trademark, and only if the court is satisfied that this plea is *prima facie* tenable, can it adjourn the case for three months to allow the party to apply to the High Court for rectification. Since the petitioner failed to follow this procedure, the petitions were deemed not maintainable. The petitions were dismissed, but the petitioner was granted liberty to file appropriate petitions after following the procedure under Section 124 of the Trademarks Act, 1999.	
12.	C.O (COMM.IPD-TM) 794/2022	Manoj Kumar Goyal, Sole Proprietor Of M/S Manoj Sweets- **Appellant** *verses* The Controller general Of Patents Designs And Trademarks Also Registrar Of Trademark Registry & Anr- **Respondent**	The petitioner contended that he had conceived and adopted the "MANOJ SWEETS" mark in 2002 and had prior use and registration in classes 30 and 43, while Respondent No. 2 subsequently obtained registration of an identical mark, "MANOJ BAKERS" in class 30, which was not cited during examination. Initially, on December 19, 2022, the court issued notice to the respondents and set the matter for further proceedings. In a subsequent order dated February 5, 2024, the High Court of Delhi, presided over by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjeev Narula, noted that Respondent No. 2, despite being served, neither appeared nor filed a reply, leading the court to proceed ex-parte. The court found that the concurrent registration of the "MANOJ BAKERS" mark and the petitioner's "MANOJ SWEETS" mark could not be sustained. Accepting the petitioner's allegations and evidence of use, the court ordered the cancellation of the label/device mark "MANOJ BAKERS" under trademark no. 1857105 in class 30, directing the Trademarks Registry to issue an appropriate notification to that effect.	**Case Disposed**
13.	W.P.(C)-IPD 44/2023	M/S Natures Magic World- **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. Advocate :Deepak Kumar Mahapatra **Respondent**	In M/S NATURES MAGIC WORLD vs. THE REGISTRAR OF TRADEMARKS & ANR. (W.P.(C)-IPD 44/2023) , the Petitioner sought to record the assignment of the "COLORESSENCE" trademark (Reg. No. 1541613). The assignment, dating back to February 2016 , faced obstacles due to a name change of the original owner and filing confusions. The Registrar of Trademarks acknowledged the issue and expressed willingness to hold a hearing. Justice Prathiba M. Singh, on October 12, 2023, directed a hearing within one week and a subsequent order	**Case Disposed**

			within four weeks, thereby disposing of the petition	

TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT (SECTION 29)

S.no	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	CS(COMM) 15/2025	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Petitioners** *verses* Verizon Careers & Ors. **Defendants**	The plaintiffs, part of the Verizon Group, filed a suit seeking a permanent injunction against the defendants for misuse of their registered and well-known trademark "VERIZON". It was alleged that the defendants operated a fraudulent recruitment scam using the plaintiffs' former corporate name, domain (www.verizon-careers.com), and logo, including impersonation through fake emails, interviews, and demand for payment from job seekers. The Court noted a *prima facie* case and granted an ex-parte ad interim injunction restraining the defendants from using the VERIZON mark or similar elements in any manner. The domain registrar was directed to suspend the infringing domain and share registrant details; other platforms involved were also directed to disclose relevant records.	**Case Pending**
2.	CS(COMM) 245/2025	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. – **Plaintiff** *verses* Amresh Kamat – **Defendant**	The plaintiffs, part of the Verizon Group, filed a commercial IP suit seeking an injunction against the defendant for unauthorised use of the well-known trademark "VERIZON". The defendant was allegedly running a business under the name Verizon Safety Services, misrepresenting affiliation with the plaintiffs, and using the infringing mark across multiple online platforms and a domain name. The Court, finding a *prima facie* case, granted an ex-parte ad interim injunction restraining the defendant from using the VERIZON name, domain, and related digital assets. The defendant was directed to take down infringing listings within three weeks.	**Case Pending**
3.	CS (COMM) 1182/2024	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiffs** *verses*	Verizon filed a trademark infringement suit against Triiroute Visas (previously Verizone Visa Overseas), alleging unauthorized and deceptive use of marks like VERIZONE, VERIZONE VISA, and related domains/emails. These were found structurally	**Case Disposed**

		Triiroute Visas Overseas Pvt Ltd (erstwhile Verizone Visa Overseas Pvt Ltd) & Anr. – **Defendants**	and phonetically similar to Verizon's well-known registered mark VERIZON. The defendants continued use despite legal notices and an initial undertaking to cease. Following a pre-suit notice, the defendants acknowledged infringement and confirmed they would cease using the VERIZON-formative marks. The Court, satisfied with the undertaking, decreed the suit in favour of Verizon as per prayer clauses 82(i), (ii), (iii), and (v). Liberty was granted to approach the Court again if the defendants use the infringing mark post 28 December 2024. The suit and applications were disposed.	
4.	CS (COMM) 785/2024	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiffs** *verses* Aerosylt Ventures Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. **Defendants**	Verizon filed a trademark infringement suit against Aerosylt Ventures Pvt. Ltd. and A2P Resources Pvt. Ltd. for unauthorized use of the mark VERIZON, including domain (www.verizonenergy.in) and email ID (mail.verizonenergy@gmail.com), alleging passing off and infringement. Despite a name change to Aerosylt, defendants continued using the infringing mark. The Court took note of plaintiffs' registered rights and goodwill in the VERIZON trademark, declared "well-known" in a previous suit [CS (COMM) 220/2023]. An ex parte ad interim injunction was granted, restraining the defendants from using the impugned mark or any deceptively similar variants. Defendants confirmed they were in settlement talks and did not oppose confirmation of the injunction. The Court made the injunction order effective till final adjudication.	**Case Pending**
5.	CS(COMM) 805/2024	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors **Plaintiff** *verses* Dr. Neeraj Yadav & Anr. **Defendants**	The plaintiffs, part of the Verizon Group, filed a trademark infringement and passing off suit against the defendants for unauthorized use of deceptively similar marks such as "VERIEZON," "VERIEZON HOSPITAL," and the domain www.veriezonhospital.com, among others. The mark "VERIZON" is a registered, coined, and well-known trademark under Section 2(1)(zg) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, widely used across telecommunications and healthcare sectors globally, including in India. The plaintiffs submitted that the defendants had no authorization to use the impugned marks and were falsely associating their hospital and pharmacy services with the plaintiffs' brand. Despite being served, the defendants failed to appear in court. An email	**Case Disposed**

			from the defendants indicated willingness to change the name, which further supported the plaintiffs' claim of bad faith adoption. The Court held that a *prima facie* case for injunction was made out. Accordingly, the defendants were restrained from using the impugned marks or any deceptively similar variants. However, the injunction was directed to take effect from 1 November 2024.	
6.	CS(COMM) 909/2024	Vishnu and Company Trademarks Pvt. Ltd. – **Plaintiff** *verses* Dharmani Patel & Ors. – **Defendant**	The plaintiff, owner of the "VIMAL" trademark, filed a suit against the defendants for operating fake websites misrepresenting association with the plaintiff. The Court granted an ex parte ad-interim injunction and later decreed the suit against Defendant No.6 (GoDaddy) for domain transfer. Defendants 1–5 were proceeded ex parte and a permanent injunction was granted against them.	**Case Disposed**
7.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 145/2023	Gagan Singhal **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, Gagan Singhal, filed a rectification petition under Section 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, seeking cancellation of Respondent No. 2's registered device mark "PHOOL LOBAN", on grounds that the terms "Phool" and "Loban" are generic and descriptive of the goods. The petitioner argued that the registration unjustly attempts to monopolise terms commonly used in the pooja samagri trade. Despite being granted multiple opportunities, the respondents failed to file a reply, leading to the closure of their right to do so. The Court proceeded ex parte and held that while the respondent may retain rights over the full device mark, no exclusive rights can be claimed over the words "Phool" or "Loban". A disclaimer to that effect was directed to be added to the trademark registration, and the matter was disposed of accordingly.	**Case Disposed**
8.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 152/2023	Gagan Singhal **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, Gagan Singhal, filed a rectification petition under Section 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, seeking cancellation of Respondent No. 2's trademark registration for the mark containing the words "KONDRU" and "LOBAN". He argued that these are generic, descriptive terms commonly used in pooja samagri and incense-related products and cannot be monopolised. Despite multiple opportunities, the respondents failed to file replies, leading to closure of their right. The Court proceeded ex parte and held that while proprietary rights could be retained over the composite device mark, exclusivity over the individual terms "KONDRU" and "LOBAN" in	**Case Disposed**

			both English and Devanagari scripts was not permissible. A disclaimer was directed to be added to the registration, and the petition was disposed of accordingly	
9.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 149/2023	Usha International Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	Usha International Ltd. filed a rectification petition seeking cancellation of the impugned trademark registered by Respondent No. 2, who later stated before the Court that they had discontinued use of the device mark. The matter was referred to mediation, but parallel proceedings continued. Respondent No. 2 filed its reply with some delay and subsequently submitted an application to place additional documents on record, which the Court allowed. The petitioner was granted time to file a fresh rejoinder, which it failed to do, prompting the Court to grant a final extension.	**Case Pending**
10.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 246/2023 & C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 247/2023	Modicare Limited **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondents**	Modicare Limited filed a rectification petition seeking cancellation of trademark registrations held by Respondent No. 2 for the marks "D-10" and "D-TAN", on grounds of non-distinctiveness and improper registration. The Court granted the petitioner permission to place additional documents on record. Respondent No. 2 sought time to file replies, which were later filed with condonation of delay and accepted without objection from the petitioner. Multiple hearings have taken place, some of which were adjourned due to unavailability or requests from either party.	**Case Pending**
11.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 80/2023	Usha International Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr. **Respondent**	Usha International Ltd. filed a rectification petition seeking cancellation of Trademark No. 4609140 registered in Class 7 under the mark "VIPUSHA," arguing it conflicted with its own rights. During the proceedings, Respondent No. 2 informed the Court that they had voluntarily filed Form TM-P with the Trademark Registry seeking cancellation of their own registration. The Registry confirmed cancellation of the impugned mark, making the petition infructuous.	**Case Disposed**
12.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 82/2023	Crocs Inc. **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks New Delhi & Anr. **Respondent**	Crocs Inc. filed a rectification petition seeking cancellation of a trademark registered, alleging infringement of its IP rights. The Court allowed Crocs to place additional documents on record and issued notice to the respondents. Respondent No. 2 was served but repeatedly failed to file a reply or written submissions despite being represented since April 2023. The Court accordingly closed their right to do so and listed the matter for arguments	**Case Pending**

13.	C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 92/2023	Jitendra Kumar **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	Petitioner filed a rectification petition challenging the registration of the trademark "WHITE BOY" granted to Respondent No. 2, arguing that he had prior adoption and use of the mark since 2010. He alleged that Respondent No. 2, operating in the same locality, dishonestly imitated the mark and filed its application just one day prior to the petitioner's application. The Court issued notice and allowed time for reply and rejoinder. While Respondent No. 2 filed its reply, Respondent No. 1 failed to do so and its right was closed. The petitioner was granted a final opportunity to file rejoinder by 24 November 2023, and the matter was listed for completion of pleadings on 5 February 2024	**Case Disposed**
14.	CS(COMM) 105/2023	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiffs** *verses* Verizon Global & Ors. **Defendants**	Verizon Trademark Services LLC filed a suit for permanent injunction and damages against entities operating under the name "Verizon Global," alleging trademark infringement. An interim injunction was granted which was later made absolute. Defendant No. 3 was removed from the array of parties, and Defendant No. 2 was later also deleted as a proforma party. Defendant No. 1 was served via email and WhatsApp but failed to file a written statement, leading to the closure of its right to do so. The plaintiffs subsequently filed for summary judgment, which was granted, thereby decreeing the suit. The matter is currently pending for cost taxation proceedings, with a memo of cost amounting to ₹1,98,753 prepared by the Registry and finalisation scheduled for 8 August 2025.	**Case Disposed**
15.	CS(COMM) 114/2023	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust **Plaintiff** *verses* Gurvinder Singh & Ors. **Defendants**	This trademark infringement suit was filed by Calvin Klein Trademark Trust against multiple defendants for unauthorized use of its registered trademark. The plaintiff sought to implead additional parties (defendant nos. 6 to 10), claiming they were also infringing. Initially, written statements were pending due to service disputes and lack of paper books. Over time, several defendants settled with the plaintiff during mediation facilitated by the Delhi High Court Mediation Centre. The suit has been decreed against defendant nos. 3, 4, 5, and 9 as per separate settlement agreements. Defendant nos. 6, 7, and 10 expressed willingness to negotiate and were referred for further mediation. Defendants 1, 2, and 8 were proceeded ex parte due to non-appearance.	**Case Disposed**

16.	CS(COMM) 181/2023	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiffs** *verses* Verizon Trade Services & Ors. **Defendants**	Verizon Trademark Services LLC filed a suit for permanent injunction and damages against defendants operating under "Verizon Trade Services," alleging infringement of its well-known trademark. An ex parte ad interim injunction was granted, and the defendants were directed to furnish contact details and were served thereafter. Despite service, none of the defendants filed written statements or replies, and were eventually proceeded ex parte. The Court made the interim order absolute and permitted the plaintiffs to file for summary judgment. The Court then decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiffs, restraining the defendants from using the impugned trademarks or domains (including www.foxtrade.tech and www.verizontrade.in), and awarded ₹1 lakh as costs against defendant no. 1. The matter was disposed of accordingly.	**Case Disposed**
17.	CS(COMM) 220/2023	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiff** *verses* Vikash Kumar **Defendant**	Verizon Trademark Services LLC filed a trademark infringement suit against Vikash Kumar, who was operating a business under the name "Verizon Telecom Services." The plaintiff alleged unauthorised use of its registered mark "VERIZON." Before summons were issued, the defendant voluntarily submitted an affidavit undertaking to cease all use of the mark "VERIZON," change the name of the firm to "M/s Shivay Telecom Services," and refrain from using or applying for any similar mark in the future. The Delhi High Court decreed the suit on 1 May 2023 based on the defendant's binding affidavit. While the plaintiff waived damages and costs, the Court kept open the request for declaring "VERIZON" as a well-known trademark and directed the plaintiff to submit supporting material.	**Case Disposed**
18.	(CS(COMM) 316/2023)	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiff** *verses* Verizon Pharmaceutical Private Limited & Ors. **Defendant**	Verizon Trademark Services LLC filed a suit against a pharma company for unauthorized use and attempted registration of the mark "VERIZON," despite earlier undertakings to cease use. The Delhi High Court granted an ex parte interim injunction. The matter was later settled through mediation. The defendants agreed to stop using the mark, changed their company name, withdrew the trademark application, and donated ₹30,000 to charity in lieu of damages. The suit was decreed with no order on costs.	**Case Disposed**

19.	CS (COMM) 236/2021	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiffs** *verses* Innovation Meditech Pvt. Ltd. **Defendants**	The plaintiffs filed a suit against Innovation Meditech Pvt. Ltd. for trademark infringement. The parties reached a settlement, and a joint compromise application was filed under Order XXIII Rule 3 CPC. On 25 October 2021, the Delhi High Court decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiffs based on the terms of the settlement. The Court directed the parties to remain bound by the agreed terms, and also ordered a refund of the entire court fees paid by Plaintiff No. 3, Verizon Communications India Pvt. Ltd.	**Case Disposed**
20.	CS(COMM) 756/2022	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiff** *verses* Selvaganapathy Swaminathan & Anr **Defendant**	On November 2, 2022, Hon'ble Ms. Justice Prathiba M. Singh issued an ex-parte ad-interim injunction against defendant no. 1, restraining them from manufacturing or selling products under the 'VERYZON' mark and from using the domain name www.veryzon.in which was ordered to remain blocked. Subsequently, in a final order dated March 4, 2024, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anish Dayal noted that the defence of defendant no. 1 had been struck off for non-appearance and failure to file a written statement, and defendant no. 2, the Domain Name Registrar, had complied with the previous order regarding the infringing domain name. The court decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiffs, issuing a permanent injunction restraining defendant no. 1 from using the 'VERYZON' mark or any deceptively similar mark for products such as lifts and elevators, and directed the transfer or blocking of the impugned domain name. Additionally, the plaintiffs were awarded costs and nominal damages totalling Rs. 2,50,000/-.	**Case Disposed**
21.	CS(COMM) 407/2023	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiff** *verses* Lathiya Hanshaben Arvindbhai & Anr. Advocate :Vaishali Mittal **Defendant**	In **VERIZON TRADEMARK SERVICES LLC & ORS. VS.** LATHIYA HANSHABEN ARVINDBHAI & ANR.(CS(COMM) 407/2023), Plaintiffs, including Verizon Trademark Services LLC, seek to stop Defendants from infringing their 'VERIZON' trademarks with the mark 'VRIZON'. Despite cease-and-desist notices and a successful trademark opposition, Defendants continued using the infringing mark. On June 1, 2023, Justice Sanjeev Narula granted an ex-parte ad-interim injunction against the Defendants. After confirming Defendant service on September 6, 2023 , Justice Prathiba M. Singh, on November 6, 2023, proceeded ex parte against the Defendants and confirmed the interim injunction for the suit's pendency. The case is listed for February 29, 2024.	**Case Disposed**

22.	CS(COMM) 777/2023	Vishnu And Company Trademarks Private Limited & Anr. **Plaintiff** *verses* Rising Sun Food Products Private Limited & Ors. Advocate :Ankur Sangal **Defendant**	In **VISHNU AND COMPANY TRADEMARKS PRIVATE LIMITED & ANR. VS. RISING SUN FOOD PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.** (CS(COMM) 777/2023), Plaintiffs, owners of the "VIMAL" trademark for pan masala and gutkha, sued Defendants for infringing on their mark and trade dress with similar products intended for export. On October 20, 2023, an ex-parte ad-interim injunction was granted against the Defendants. Following subsequent hearings, and after Defendants 1, 2, and 4 affirmed they were not engaged in manufacturing counterfeit goods and did not object, an injunction decree was passed on October 23, 2024, in favour of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs waived claims for costs and damages, leading to a 50% refund of court fees.	**Case Disposed**
23.	CS(COMM) 932/2023	Verizon Trademark Services LLC & Ors. **Plaintiff** *verses* Verizone Broadband Services Pvt Ltd. Advocate :Vaishali Mittal **Defendant**	The Delhi High Court case, VERIZON TRADEMARK SERVICES LLC & ORS. VS. VERIZONE BROADBAND SERVICES PVT LTD (CS(COMM) 932/2023), involved a trademark infringement dispute where Verizon secured an ex-parte ad-interim injunction on January 24, 2024, which was made absolute on April 9, 2024. This occurred after the Defendant acknowledged Verizon's rights and undertook to cease all infringing activities, including changing their company name. The suit was decreed on September 30, 2024, under Order XXIII Rule 3 read with Section 151 CPC, reflecting a settlement where the Plaintiffs waived costs and damages, resulting in a full court fee refund.	**Case Disposed**
24.	FAO (COMM) 110/2023	Hugo Boss Trademark Management Gmbh And Co Kg **Plaintiff** *verses* Swish Boss Apparels Pvt Ltd	HUGO BOSS TRADE MARK MANAGEMENT GMBH AND CO KG (appellant) filed FAO (COMM) 110/2023, challenging a partial injunction order against SWISH BOSS APPARELS PVT LTD (respondent) for using "SWISH BOSS" which the appellant argued was deceptively similar to its registered 'BOSS' trademark (Class 25, Application No. 493925). The Delhi High Court issued an interim injunction against "Swish Boss" on May 11, 2023. Subsequent hearings noted settlement talks, and on February 29, 2024, the appellant confirmed settlement terms were recorded, leading to the appeal's withdrawal.	**Case Disposed**

		Advocate :S K Bansal-**Defendant**		

ARBITRATION/MEDIATION PROCEEDINGS

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 211/2025	Siddhast Intellectual Property Innovations Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* CGPDTM & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a petition under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, seeking extension of the mandate of the Sole Arbitrator appointed in a contractual dispute involving access to a patent database and development of a search platform. The arbitration proceedings, initiated in January 2021, had reached the stage of cross-examination of the respondents' witnesses. With no objection from either respondent, the Delhi High Court extended the Arbitrator's mandate by six months The Arbitrator was requested to conclude the proceedings expeditiously.	**Case Disposed**
2.	O.M.P.(MISC.)(COMM.) 640/2024	Siddhast Intellectual Property Innovation Pvt Ltd **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks & Anr. – **Respondent**	The petitioner sought an extension of the arbitral mandate under Section 29A of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The arbitration proceedings stemmed from an earlier court-directed reference in ARB.P. 45/2021. A previous extension had been granted, and the proceedings were ongoing at the cross-examination stage. Respondent No. 2 filed an affidavit blaming delays on the petitioner and Respondent No. 1. However, the Court noted that there were no requests from Respondent No. 2 seeking hearing dates from the arbitrator. All parties assured their cooperation and agreed to avoid unnecessary adjournments	**Case Disposed**
3.	FAO-IPD 2/2021 & FAO-IPD 1/2021	M/s Mankastu Impex Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Kent RO Systems Ltd. **Respondent**	This case pertained to a trademark dispute over the mark "HEPA PURE". Mankastu Impex Pvt. Ltd., the plaintiff, sought a permanent injunction against Kent RO Systems Ltd. for allegedly infringing its registered marks "HEPA PURE" (word and device, Reg. Nos. 2780036 & 3172041) under Class 11. Kent, the defendant, also filed rectification applications to cancel these registrations, arguing that "HEPA" is a generic term in air purification	**Case Disposed**

			technology and thus not eligible for exclusive registration. In 2018, the Court granted an ex-parte interim injunction restraining Kent from using "HEPA PURE". Despite some disputes regarding online listings that continued to display the impugned mark, the Court reinforced its directions for removal. Later, in 2022, both parties agreed to consolidate the suit and rectification appeals for joint trial. However, the matter was ultimately referred to mediation. A settlement was reached on 13 September 2022, where Mankastu agreed not to object to Kent's use of "HEPA PURE" or its variants. In return, Kent agreed to withdraw its rectification appeals. As a result, the suit and appeals were disposed of in terms of the settlement, with full court fee refunded to the plaintiff.	
4.	CS(COMM) 319/2023	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust- **Petitioner** *verses* Mr. Bhagat & Ors. Advocate :Shobhit Agrawal **Respondent**	In the case **CALVIN KLEIN TRADEMARK TRUST VS. MR. BHAGAT & ORS.** (CS(COMM) 319/2023), the plaintiff, represented by advocates including Mr. Shobhit Agrawal, sued the defendants for trademark and copyright infringement, along with passing off. Key legal provisions referenced in the proceedings included Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 for exemption from pre-institution mediation, and Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 of the CPC for interim injunctions. Contempt petitions (CCP(O) 69-71/2023) under Article 215 were also filed against certain defendants. The matter was ultimately resolved through mediation, leading to six settlement agreements dated August 9, 2024. Consequently, on October 18, 2024, the Delhi High Court decreed the suit in Favor of the plaintiff, disposing of the case based on the terms of these settlements.	**Case Disposed**
5.	O.M.P.(MISC.) (COMM.) 416/2023	Siddhast Intellectual Property Innovations Pvt. Ltd.	In *SIDDHAST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY INNOVATIONS PVT. LTD. VS. CONTROLLER GENERAL OF PATENTS DESIGNS AND TRADEMARK CGPDTM AND ANR* (O.M.P.(MISC.) (COMM.) 416/2023), the Delhi High Court addressed a petition seeking to extend the mandate of a Sole Arbitrator appointed by a prior court order. Despite initial procedural challenges concerning service of notice, the Petitioner, represented by Mr. Abhishek Chandra Mishra, successfully argued for the extension. A key legal contention	**Case Disposed**

		Petitioner *verses* Controller General Of Patents Designs And Trademark Cgpdtm And Anr Advocate :Abhishek Chandra Mishra **Respondent**	involved excluding the pandemic-induced period from the arbitral timelines, referencing the Supreme Court's precedent in *In Re: Cognizance for Extension of Limitation* (2022) 3 SCC 117. Given the consent from the respondents, the Court, on February 26, 2024, judiciously granted a six-month extension to the arbitrator's mandate, commencing from that date, and crucially, validated all proceedings undertaken after the previous mandate's expiration, thereby ensuring continuity and efficiency in the arbitration.	
6.	CS(COMM) 319/2023	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust- **Petitioner** *verses* Mr. Bhagat & Ors. Advocate :Shobhit Agrawal **Respondent**	In the case **CALVIN KLEIN TRADEMARK TRUST VS. MR. BHAGAT & ORS.** (CS(COMM) 319/2023), the plaintiff, represented by advocates including Mr. Shobhit Agrawal, sued the defendants for trademark and copyright infringement, along with passing off. Key legal provisions referenced in the proceedings included Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 for exemption from pre-institution mediation, and Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 of the CPC for interim injunctions. Contempt petitions (CCP(O) 69-71/2023) under Article 215 were also filed against certain defendants. The matter was ultimately resolved through mediation, leading to six settlement agreements dated August 9, 2024. Consequently, on October 18, 2024, the Delhi High Court decreed the suit in Favor of the plaintiff, disposing of the case based on the terms of these settlements.	**Case Disposed**

RENEWAL OF TRADEMARK (SECTION 25)

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	W.P.(C)-IPD 5/2025	Amir Hasan trading as Chand Bidi Co. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a writ petition seeking renewal of the trademark "CHAND BIDI". It was submitted that the renewal application could not be filed on time as the petitioner did not receive the mandatory O-3 notice from the Registrar. The Court issued notice and directed the Registry to summon the complete digitised record related to the trademark. The respondent appeared and was granted time to file a counter-affidavit.	**Case Pending**

REGISTRATION OF ASSIGNMENTS AND TRANSMISSIONS (SECTION 45)

S.no	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	W.P.(C)-IPD 4/2025	Urbanzen Techprise **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner sought a direction to the Registrar of Trademarks to take on record a deed of assignment for TM No. 5052483 (Class 3), executed in their favour by respondent no.2. It was submitted that although the deed was filed on 2 June 2022 and respondent no.2 raised no objection, the assignment had not yet been processed. On 31 January 2025, the Court was informed that a hearing was fixed for 17 February 2025, following which the petition was Case Disposed of. However, subsequent hearings were repeatedly adjourned. A hearing was eventually held on 16 April 2025, but no order followed. The petitioner re-approached the Court, which directed respondent no.1 to conduct the next scheduled hearing on 9 June 2025 and issue a speaking order thereafter.	**Case Pending**

REFUSAL UNDER SECTION 11 & 12

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 76/2024	Innocenti SA **Appellant** *verses* Examiner of Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	The appellant challenged the order dated 28 May 2024, rejecting its trademark application for the mark “Lambretta” under Section 11 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. The refusal was based on prior registrations in the name of Scooters India Limited. The appellant submitted that Scooters India Limited has not used the mark in India since 1997 and that rectification proceedings have been initiated due to non-use. It was also submitted that Lambretta scooters were earlier marketed in India through Automobile Products of India. The Court took note of these submissions and directed the impleadment of Scooters India Limited as a party to the proceedings. Necessary procedural applications were allowed, and the matter was adjourned.	**Case Pending**
2.	CA (COMM.IPD-TM) 4/2021	Lite Bite Travel Foods Pvt Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, filed an appeal against the Registrar of Trademarks', which rejected its trademark application for the mark “OASIS LOUNGE”. The rejection was primarily under Section 11 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, on the ground that a third party had already registered the mark “OASIS” in the same class for food and catering services. The appellant argued that it had been operating a lounge under the said mark at the Chhatrapati	**Case Disposed**

			Shivaji International Airport, Mumbai, since 2018, and had submitted documents evidencing concurrent use. However, these documents were allegedly not considered by the Registrar. During subsequent hearings, the appellant submitted a note of arguments. The respondent declined to file written submissions, choosing instead to rely on the material already on record.	
3.	C.A. (COMM.IP D-TM) 16/2021	M/s Karim Hotels Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Appellant filed an appeal before the Delhi High Court challenging the refusal of their trademark application for "KARIM'S THE MUGHAL CHEF AKBARI MURGH MASALA." The application was rejected by the Senior Examiner of Trademarks under Sections 9 and 11 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, citing descriptiveness, lack of distinctiveness, and absence of a No Objection Certificate (NOC). The appellant contended that they own multiple prior trademarks such as 'KARIM', 'KARIM'S', and 'KAREEM', and enjoy longstanding goodwill stemming from the iconic Karim's restaurant established in 1913 by Haji Karimuddin. The Court noted that the Registrar failed to consider the appellant's existing registrations, including a closely related mark which had already been accepted. Accordingly, the Court found the refusal unsustainable and set it aside. The Registrar was directed to process the application for registration within three months, subject to standard disclaimers over descriptive elements like "AKBARI MURGH MASALA." The matter was disposed of.	**Case Disposed**
4.	C.A. (COMM.IP D-TM) 156/2021	Vipan Sharma **Appellant** *verses* Trademark Office **Respondent**	The appellant, Vipan Sharma, filed this appeal challenging the refusal of his trademark application by the Trademark Office. The grounds for refusal were based on Section 11 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, which pertains to the likelihood of confusion with earlier trademarks. However, the appellant argued that the impugned order did not contain any finding regarding the likelihood of confusion—an essential condition for invoking Section 11. The Court observed that this argument appeared *prima facie* valid. The matter was re-notified to allow the government counsel to address this issue. Subsequently, the case was again re-notified for a preliminary hearing due to a scheduling request from the appellant's side	**Disposed**

5.	C.A. (COMM.IP D-TM) 133/2021	Castrol Limited Appellant *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Appellant filed an appeal challenging the rejection of its trademark application for the word mark 'DURATEC', which pertains to lubricants for gas-fired power generation units. The Registrar of Trademarks had refused the mark under Sections 9 and 11(1)(a) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, citing prior marks. Castrol contended that these cited marks had already been withdrawn by their proprietor before the examination report was issued and should not have formed the basis of refusal. Additionally, the cited marks were limited to different goods and had been altered in scope. The Delhi High Court found merit in Castrol's submissions and held that the cited marks should not have influenced the refusal. The Court set aside the refusal order and directed the Trade Marks Registry to re-examine the application afresh, granting Castrol an opportunity for a personal hearing and to submit further documentation.	**Case Disposed**
6.	W.P.(C)-IPD 13/2025	Nirav Nimmi Corporation **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondents**	The petitioner challenged the examination report dated 7 January 2025 issued by the Registrar of Trademarks in relation to trademark application for the mark 'ARJUN', filed by respondent no. 2. The petitioner argued that the Delhi Trademarks Registry lacked territorial jurisdiction and wrongly recognized respondent no. 2 as a prior user under Section 12 of the Trademarks Act, 1999. The Court issued notice on the writ petition and on a subsequent application seeking a stay on the operation of the examination report.	**Case Pending**
7.	W.P.(C)-IPD 14/2025	Nirav Nimmi Corporation **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner filed a writ petition challenging the examination report dated 7 January 2025 issued by the Registrar of Trademarks in relation to trademark application No. 6792318 (Class 30) for the mark 'ARJUN', filed by respondent no. 2. It was argued that the Delhi Trademarks Registry lacked territorial jurisdiction and that the report wrongly recognized respondent no. 2 as a prior user under Section 12 of the Trademarks Act, 1999.	**Case Pending**
8.	C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 124/2022	Joseph Vogele Ag- **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The Joint Registrar (Judicial) noted that no stenographer was provided from the pool of Establishment. It was recorded that notice had been previously issued to the Respondent (Registrar of Trademarks) by the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) The Court directed the parties to coordinate with the registry and remove all objections, as far as possible, within four weeks positively.	**Case Disposed**

			The registry was also instructed to file a fresh report regarding any remaining deficiencies. The appellant challenged the refusal of their multi-class trademark application for the word mark 'AutoSet Plus' under Classes 07 and 09. The initial refusal by the Registrar was based on Section 11(1)(a) and Section 11(1)(b) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, citing the mark's identity or similarity to earlier trademarks and the consequent likelihood of confusion among the public The appellant, in its appeal under Section 91 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, contested the refusal order dated 05th March 2019, and the Statement of Grounds dated 10th July, 2019. They argued that one of the purportedly conflicting marks was their own, another had been abandoned, and for the remaining cited marks, they had secured 'no objection' or letters of consent from the proprietor, Rieter Ingolstadt GmbH. Furthermore, the appellant highlighted that 'AutoSet Plus' was already a registered Community Trademark (EU CTM) and held registrations in several other countries like Japan, Russia, and Germany, indicating co-existence. The High Court of Delhi allowed the appeal. The Court set aside the refusal order and directed the Trademarks Registry to proceed with the registration application for 'AutoSet Plus'. The mark is to be advertised within three months, and any subsequent opposition will be decided on its own merits. The Court also stipulated that the rights in the mark would be limited to the specific combination of words 'AutoSet Plus', and no exclusive rights would be granted for the word 'Plus' individually. This disclaimer is to be reflected in the Trademarks Journal upon advertisement. The order was passed on April 20, 2023	
9.	C.A. (COMM.IPD-TM) 70/2022	Maharashi Patanjali Vidya Mandir Samiti **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	Maharshi Patanjali Vidya Mandir Samiti appealed against the refusal of its multi-class trademark application for "PATANJALI RISHIKUL" by the Registrar of Trademarks. The Registrar had initially rejected the application on 11 June 2018 under Sections 11(1)(a) and 11(1)(b) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, citing the likelihood of confusion with existing marks and the well-known status of "PATANJALI" in relation to Ayurvedic and related products. During the appeal, the appellant amended its application, changing the	**Case Disposed**

			mark from a word mark ("PATANJALI NURSERY SCHOOL") to a composite device mark featuring the words "PATANJALI RISHIKUL" and the phrase "Our Children Our Future," along with distinctive graphical elements. The appellant also agreed to disclaim exclusive rights over the word "PATANJALI," acknowledging its status as a well-known mark and its association with Maharshi Patanjali, the author of Yoga Sutra. The Court, noting these modifications and the disclaimer, set aside the impugned refusal order and directed the Trademarks Registry to process the amended application (Form TM-M) within four weeks. The modified mark is to be advertised before acceptance under Section 20(1) of the Act, with a clear disclaimer that no exclusive rights are claimed over "PATANJALI." The Registry must also notify the proprietors of cited marks upon advertisement, and any opposition will be decided on its own merits. The appeal was thus allowed, and the matter disposed of with directions for compliance.	
10.	C.A.(COMM.IPDTM) 74/2022	Koninklijke Haskoningdhv Groep B.V. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The Delhi High Court, on September 19, 2022, addressed an appeal challenging an order dated April 17, 2018, and a subsequent 'Statement of Grounds of Decision' from July 26, 2018. These prior orders, issued by the Senior Examiner of Trade Marks, had rejected the appellant's trademark application number 2449661 in Classes 35, 37, and 42 for a specific mark featuring a star device. The refusal was based on a cited mark in the Examination Report dated June 7, 2016. The High Court noted that the Senior Examiner had not adequately considered the conditions placed on the cited mark, specifically a disclaimer regarding the exclusive right to the star device. The court also observed that, *prima facie*, the appellant's star device and the cited mark did not appear deceptively similar and acknowledged that both marks were registered with the EUIPO. Consequently, the impugned order and 'statement of grounds of decision' were set aside, and the appellant's application for trademark registration was directed to proceed further[6]. The court clarified that any future objections to the mark's registration should be considered by the respondent without	**Case Disposed**

			being influenced by the present order. The appeal was allowed with these terms.	

MISCELLANEOUS

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	CS(OS) 664/2024	Vishnu and Company Trademarks Pvt. Ltd. **Plaintiff** *verses* Devinder Singh **Defendant**	The plaintiff filed a suit for specific performance of an Agreement to Sell dated 04.05.2022 concerning land in Salahpur, Delhi. It claimed to have paid ₹1.02 crore out of the total ₹2.76 crore to the defendant, who failed to execute the sale deed. The plaintiff sought injunction fearing third-party rights over the property. On *prima facie* satisfaction, the Court granted an ex parte ad-interim injunction, directing the defendant to maintain status quo over title and possession. The defendant later appeared and filed a written statement; replication and delay condonation applications were also taken on record. Pleadings are now complete, and the matter is listed for admission/denial of documents	**Case Pending**
2.	CS(OS) 665/2024 and CS(OS) 666/2024 and CS(OS) 667/2024	Vishnu and Company Trademarks Pvt. Ltd. **Plaintiff** *verses* Ramesh Chand & Ors. **Respondent**	The plaintiff filed a suit for specific performance of an Agreement to Sell concerning land measuring 18 bighas 8 biswas in Village Salahpur, Delhi, for ₹20.35 crore. ₹7.5 crore was paid, but the defendants failed to execute the sale deed. A legal notice was issued; the defendants acknowledged the agreement and payment but claimed they lacked a copy of the agreement. The Court granted an ex parte status quo order regarding title and possession. Pleadings have since been completed, and replications were taken on record after condonation of delay.	**Case Pending**
3.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 13/2023	Rosburn Holdings Limited & Anr. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademark **Respondent**	The case concerns a trademark dispute initiated by Rosburn Holdings. On 30 August 2024, the respondents sought adjournment citing ongoing settlement discussions. The Court allowed time and listed the matter for 7 November 2024. On 19 December 2024, the parties again confirmed that settlement talks were still in progress.	**Dismissed**

4.	C.O.(COMM .IPD-CR) 6/2023	Hugo Boss Trademark Management GmbH Co. KG **Petitioner** *verses* Sandeep Arora **Respondent**	The petitioner, Hugo Boss Trademark Management GmbH and Co. KG, filed this copyright cancellation petition seeking removal of the registered artwork titled "Arras The BOSS" held by the respondent. The petitioner alleged that the respondent's mark infringes its own trademark. The Delhi High Court issued notice to the respondents and requisitioned the copyright records. Service was effected via email as physical delivery attempts failed. The respondent eventually stood served, and the matter is listed for further directions before the Court. The case is currently pending adjudication.	**Case Disposed**
5.	C.O. (COMM.IPD -TM) 7/2021	Mahesh Gupta **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, filed the present petition under the Trade Marks Act, challenging the actions of the Registrar of Trademarks and seeking relief in relation to a dispute also forming the subject matter of CS(COMM) 514/2021. Subsequently, an application was filed by the petitioner seeking withdrawal of the petition on account of a settlement reached between the parties in the related civil suit. The request was not opposed by either respondent. Consequently, the Court allowed the withdrawal and dismissed the petition as withdrawn. The Court also directed a refund of the court fee in light of the early settlement, relying on Section 89 CPC and Section 16 of the Court Fees Act, 1870.	**Case Disposed**
6.	C.A. (COMM.IPD -TM) 22/2021	Cardinal Health Switzerland 515 GmbH **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appeal was originally filed before the IPAB and was later transferred to the Delhi High Court following the enactment of the Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021. The appellant, sought to withdraw the appeal, and on the next listing, counsel for the appellant confirmed this intent. Accordingly, the Delhi High Court dismissed the appeal.	**Case Disposed**
7.	**C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 43/2022**	3m Deutschland Gmbh **Petitioner** *verses* Senior Examiner Of Trademarks **Respondent**	To rectify this discrepancy, the court directed that CA(COMM. IPD TM) 43/2022 be treated as disposed of. Furthermore, the documents from CA(COMM. IPD TM) 43/2022, along with a copy of this order, are to be tagged with the file for CA(COMM. IPD TM) 105/2021.	**Case Disposed**
8.	**C.O. (COMM.IPD -TM) 661/2022**	Crocs Inc **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks New Delhi & Anr- **Respondent**	On December 5, 2022, the court issued a notice to the defendants, with the next hearing scheduled for February 17, 2023. Subsequently, in an order dated April 8, 2024, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anish Dayal allowed the petition, directing the removal of the trademark 'CROCKSCLUB' (Application No. 2178067 in Class 25), registered in favour of respondent no. 2, from the Register of Trademarks. The court	**Case Disposed**

			found that the impugned trademark should not have been registered due to its similarity to the petitioner's trademark, the likelihood of confusion, and the risk of association with Crocs Inc.'s goods and trademarks. The Registrar of Trademarks is required to carry out this removal within six weeks.	
9.	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 90/2022	Usha International Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	The petition filed by Usha International Limited seeking the cancellation of the trademark 'WSHA' registered under no. 4222129 in Class 7 for sewing machines and parts, which was registered in favour of Tarun Arora trading as Krishan Enterprises. Usha International Limited asserted prior use of its 'USHA' mark since 1936, with an earliest registration in 1942 for sewing machines, arguing that 'WSHA' was deceptively similar. Initially, on January 31, 2022, the court issued notice to the respondents and listed the matter for further proceedings. In a subsequent and final order dated July 20, 2022, Hon'ble Ms. Justice Prathiba M. Singh granted a permanent injunction restraining Tarun Arora from using the 'WSHA' mark or any other mark like 'USHA' for sewing machines and their parts. Furthermore, the court ordered the cancellation of the 'WSHA' trademark registration and directed the defendant to pay Rs. 2,00,000/- towards court fees to Usha International Limited. The suit and the cancellation petition were accordingly disposed of.	**Case Disposed**
10.	CS(COMM) 368/2022	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust **Petitioner** *verses* M/S. K.K.Garments, Through Its Owner Mr. Kartik & Ors. **Respondent**	On May 27, 2022, the court, presided over by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Navin Chawla, granted the plaintiff's request for exemption from advance service of the suit and appointed Local Commissioner(s) to visit the defendants' premises, seize counterfeit products, and submit a report, with the order not to be uploaded for one week to prevent disposal of goods. Subsequently, in a final order dated December 19, 2022 (corrected and released on December 21, 2022), Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjeev Narula noted that the parties had reached settlement agreements through mediation: one dated November 21, 2022, between the Plaintiff and Defendant No. 3, and another dated November 29, 2022, between the Plaintiff and Defendants No. 1, 2, and 4. The court found these agreements lawful and decreed the suit in favour of the Plaintiff against the defendants in terms of these settlement agreements, which are now part of the decree and binding on the parties. Additionally, the Registry was directed	**Case Disposed**

			to issue a certificate for a full refund of court fees to the Plaintiff, and the destruction of infringing materials was to be scheduled within two weeks.	
11.	CS(COMM) 384/2022	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust **Petitioner** *verses* Chardikla Accessories & Ors. **Respondent**	On May 31, 2022, Hon'ble Ms. Justice Jyoti Singh granted the plaintiff's requests for exemption from advance service and leave to file additional documents and further appointed two Local Commissioners to visit the defendants' premises, seize infringing materials, and submit reports within two weeks, with the order temporarily withheld from public upload to ensure execution of the commissions. Subsequently, in a final order dated May 23, 2023, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amit Bansal noted that the plaintiff and defendant no. 4 had jointly filed an application under Order XXIII Rule 3 of the CPC, recording a settlement between them. The court found the settlement terms lawful and decreed the suit against defendant no. 4, accordingly, also noting that the suit was already decreed against defendant nos. 1 to 3. Considering the early settlement, the Registry was directed to issue a certificate for a 50% refund of court fees to the plaintiff, and the suit, along with all pending applications, was Case Disposed of.	**Case Disposed**
12.	CS(COMM) 914/2022	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust **Petitioner** *verses* Mr. Sunny Sachdeva Trading As M/S Hache Shirts & Ors. **Respondent**	On December 23, 2022, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjeev Narula allowed the plaintiff's requests for exemptions and leave to file additional documents and appointed Local Commissioners to seize infringing goods at the defendants' premises, with the order temporarily withheld from public upload to ensure effective execution of the commission. Subsequently, in an order dated March 5, 2024, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anish Dayal noted a Settlement Agreement dated January 18, 2024, reached through mediation, between the plaintiff and defendants no. 4, 6, 7, and 9. Under this agreement, these defendants acknowledged Calvin Klein's exclusive trademark rights and were directed to hand over seized goods to the plaintiff's representatives within two weeks. Additionally, defendant no. 5 informed the court that his shop had caught fire on January 4, 2023, and he would provide supporting documentation. The case was re-notified for August 1, 2024.	**Case Disposed**

13.	W.P.(C)-IPD 7/2022	Pawandeep Singh **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	Justice Prathiba M. Singh of the Delhi High Court addressed a grievance where the petitioner's trademark application was refused without a hearing. The petitioner claimed that despite their agent logging in for two scheduled hearings, the concerned official did not, and a refusal order was issued. The court directed Ms. Shikha Dewan, Senior Examiner of Trademarks, to clarify whether a hearing was given and, if not, the reasons. The case was listed for March 23, 2022. Subsequently, in a related order, Justice C. Hari Shankar noted on May 15, 2023, that the prayers in the writ petition had been redressed and disposed of the petition.	**Case Disposed**
14.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 11/2022	Modicare Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	On January 19, 2022, Justice Asha Menon of the Delhi High Court addressed C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 11/2022, involving Modicare Limited and the Registrar of Trademarks. The appellant's counsel requested that the matter be heard together with C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 4/2022, which was listed before Justice Yogesh Khanna (now Justice Amit Bansal) on January 11, 2022. The court directed the matter to be listed before the Hon'ble Judge-in-Charge (Original Side) on January 21, 2022, for appropriate direction. Subsequently, on April 8, 2022, Joint Registrar (Judicial) Sh. Devender Nain (DHJS) noted that C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 9/2022, a connected case, was listed before the Hon'ble Court for April 19, 2022, and listed the matter before the Hon'ble Court on the same date.	**Case Disposed**
15.	W.P.(C)-IPD 46/2023	Parveen Khurana **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Copyrights, Controller General **Respondent**	In Parveen Khurana v. The Registrar of Copyrights, Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks & Anr. (W.P.(C)-IPD 46/2023), the High Court of Delhi addressed the petitioner's challenge to a disclaimer in online artistic copyright registrations under Section 2(c) of the Copyright Act, 1957. The problematic disclaimer, found in Para 17 of certificates, stated copyright would not subsist if the artistic work was industrially applied and reproduced over 50 times. Following several hearings, culminating on February 10, 2025, the respondents confirmed the online system had been updated to remove this disclaimer, attributing its presence to a "glitch in the online portal" that had been rectified. The Court directed the issuance of a fresh certificate without the disclaimer, thereby disposing of the petition.	**Case Disposed**

16.	C.A.(COMM .IPD- PAT) 108/2022	Draka Comteq B.V **Petitioner** *verses* The Controller Of Patents ,Designs And Trademarks Advocate :Tanmay Joshi **Respondent**	In the High Court of Delhi, the case of DRAKA COMTEQ B.V. v. THE CONTROLLER OF PATENTS, DESIGNS AND TRADEMARKS (C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 108/2022) involves Draka Comteq B.V. as the appellant, represented by several advocates, and The Controller of Patents, Designs and Trademarks as the respondent, also represented by multiple counsels. The case has been heard by various Justices, including Amit Bansal, Saurabh Banerjee, Sanjeev Narula, Prathiba M. Singh, and Navin Chawla. Initially, notice was issued on November 1, 2022, and replies/written submissions were directed to be filed. Deficiencies, such as missing order sheets and the need for court notice, were addressed. The respondent's reply was filed, with a delay being condoned, and the appellant chose not to respond to it. The case involved adjournments for filing documents and preparation. Arguments were heard and judgment was reserved on November 18, 2024	**Case Disposed**
17.	C.A.(COMM .IPD- PAT) 117/2022	Maharashtra Hybrid Seeds Company Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Assistant Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademark And Geographical Indications Advocate :Lakshmikumaran And Sridharan- **Respondent**	The case of **Maharashtra Hybrid Seeds Company Limited v. Assistant Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademark and Geographical Indications** (C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 117/2022) in the High Court of Delhi, represented by Lakshmikumaran and Sridharan for the appellant, primarily challenged the interpretation of Section 3(j) of the Patents Act, 1970. Despite procedural challenges including delays in respondent's reply and the appointment of an Amicus Curiae, Mr. J. Sai Deepak, to assist with the complex legal interplay between patent law and plant variety protection, the appeal was ultimately rendered infructuous on October 22, 2024, due to the patent's expiry in August 2024. However, the High Court importantly kept open the significant question of law regarding the interpretation of Section 3(j) for future consideration.	**Case Disposed**

WRIT PETITIONS

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	W.P.(C)-IPD 37/2024	M/s. Pharma Synth Formulations Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The petitioner challenged a notice issued by the Registrar of Trademarks under Section 57(4) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 seeking cancellation of the registration of its mark 'CHAIAMMRIT' which had been granted on a *"proposed to be used"* basis on 3 August 2024. The Registrar had asked for user documents, which the petitioner argued was unjustified given the *"proposed to be used"* status. On 28 November 2024, the Court stayed the operation of the notice. Subsequently, on 23 January 2025, the respondent submitted that the notice was issued inadvertently. In light of this, the Court set aside the impugned notice and allowed the writ petition.	**Case Disposed**
2.	W.P.(C)-IPD 24/2024	Mannan R. Datta **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The petitioner sought directions for expeditious disposal of his trademark application, pending since 2017. Despite no substantial opposition or hearing, the Registrar had delayed the decision. On 09.08.2024, the Court noted the prolonged delay and issued notice. Later, on it was recorded that the Registrar had passed a final order.	
3.	W.P.(C)-IPD 34/2024	PT TECH, LLC **Petitioner** *verses* Controller of Patents, Designs and Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	PT TECH, LLC filed a writ petition challenging the acceptance of a counter-statement by Respondent No. 2. The petitioner argued that the counter-statement was filed beyond the two-month limitation under Section 21(2) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and Rule 44 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, and its acceptance by the Controller was unlawful. The petitioner also opposed the Controller's direction to file evidence under Rule 45, claiming it violated statutory timelines. On 14.11.2024, the Court issued notice and granted an interim stay on proceedings before the Controller. The respondents were directed to file replies, with rejoinders to follow. On 19.03.2025, the stay was extended, and the matter was listed for further hearing on 25.07.2025. The case remains pending.	
4.	W.P.(C)-IPD 36/2024	MS Good Buy Soaps and Cosmetics Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses*	The petitioner filed a writ under Article 226 seeking directions to the Registrar of Trademarks to consider and decide their review petition. The review challenged the dismissal of Opposition against Trademark Application, which had been dismissed due to non-appearance on. The Court noted that the Registrar is empowered to review orders under	**Case Disposed**

		Trademark Registry & Ors. **Respondent**	Section 127(c) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 read with Rule 119 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017. Since the relief sought was limited, the Court did not require a reply from Respondents No. 1 and 2, nor issued notice to the private respondent (Respondent No. 3). The Court directed the Registrar (Respondent No. 2) to consider and decide the petitioner's review petition on merits within six weeks, after giving notice to the private respondent. The writ petition was accordingly disposed of.	
5.	W.P.(C)-IPD 76/2021	Bridgestone Corporation **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents Designs & Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The petitioner, filed a writ petition challenging the rejection of its opposition to a trademark application filed by the respondent. The matter arose out of the respondent's trademark application that allegedly conflicted with Bridgestone's prior rights. Earlier, the Court directed that notice of the petition be served on the respondent's Trademark Agent. The petitioner complied and submitted the agent's details to the Registry, though the record did not confirm whether service was effected. Nevertheless, the petitioner undertook to inform the agent directly about the next hearing. Subsequently, the Court heard arguments from both sides. The respondent sought permission to file brief written submissions, which was allowed. The Court reserved judgment on the same day.	**Case Disposed**
6.	W.P.(C)-IPD 6/2021	Gridlogics Technologies Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents Designs and Trademarks & Ors. – **Respondent**	This writ petition was filed challenging actions relating to a tender process. Initially, the matter was listed before the Intellectual Property Division (IPD) of the Delhi High Court due to misclassification, although the dispute did not involve any issue concerning intellectual property rights. On 23 July 2021, the counsels for both parties clarified that the case pertains to a tender-related matter and not to IPR. Consequently, the Court directed the Registry to provide an explanation for why the matter was listed before the IP Division. Subsequently, on 4 August 2021, the Court noted the error occurred due to incorrect coding. Subject to orders of the Chief Justice, the matter was directed to be placed before the appropriate Roster Bench on 17 August 2021.	**Case Disposed**
7.	W.P. (C)-IPD 55/ 2021	Allergan Inc. and Anr. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents Designs	The petitioners, Allergan Inc. and another, filed a writ petition challenging proceedings involving the Controller General of Patents, Designs, and Trademarks. The matter was heard along with a connected petition [Bridgestone Corporation v. Controller General of Patents	**Case Disposed**

		and Trademarks and Anr. – **Respondent**	Designs and Trademarks & Anr., W.P.(C)-IPD 76/2021], both pertaining to intellectual property disputes. Initial arguments were partly heard on 16.08.2022 and scheduled to resume on 30.08.2022. On 30.08.2022, arguments were concluded and the judgment was reserved. The respondents were permitted to file a brief note of submissions within three days.	
8.	W.P.(C)-IPD 5/2021	Biomoneta Research Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents, Designs and Anr. **Respondent**	Biomoneta Research Pvt. Ltd. filed the writ petition and appeal concerning delays and issues in the examination and processing of its Indian patent application. The matter involved the rejection of the patent by the Indian Patent Office, which the petitioner challenged on procedural and substantive grounds. During the pendency of the case, the petitioner highlighted the issuance of a Notice of Allowance dated 19 August 2022 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) for the corresponding US patent application. On 27 September 2022, the Court noted that the respondent's counsel had not received instructions on the USPTO development and gave a final opportunity to respond. On 27 October 2022, following submissions from both sides, the Court reserved judgment.	**Case Disposed**
9.	W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2021	Satish Jain **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	This writ petition was filed by the petitioner, Satish Jain, regarding a grievance that was already addressed by the Court in an earlier order. The matter was thereafter kept alive to monitor how the Trademark Registry was handling pendency in applications. On 30.01.2023, the Court noted that relevant data on pendency had already been filed by the Registry in a related matter (Review Petition No. 102/2020 in W.P.(C)-IPD 4/2022), which is being monitored by a coordinate bench. In light of this, the Court found it appropriate to close the present matter.	**Case Disposed**
10.	W.P.(C)-IPD 14/2021	Kaira District Cooperative Milk Producers Union Ltd & Anr. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	Kaira District Cooperative Milk Producers Union Ltd. (owners of the well-known AMUL trademark) challenged the Registrar of Trademarks for accepting and advertising deceptively similar marks without due scrutiny, in violation of Section 11 of the Trade Marks Act. The petitioners claimed that despite having filed oppositions in some cases, several infringing marks were published without proper examination. The Court directed the petitioners to file a detailed chart of such marks, including their opposition status and journal entries. Service issues regarding one respondent (applicant of a contested mark) were also	**Case Disposed**

			addressed. At a later hearing, the Central Government Counsel raised preliminary objections to the maintainability of the writ petition under Article 226.	
11.	W.P.(C)-IPD 103/2021	Parvesh Kamboj **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General of Patents and Trademarks & Ors. **Respondent**	The petitioner, Parvesh Kamboj, approached the Delhi High Court challenging steps taken by the Trade Marks Registry. On 08.11.2021, the Court issued notice and directed that any steps taken by the Registry would be subject to further orders. Respondent No.3 appeared and was directed to file a reply within four weeks, with rejoinder within two weeks thereafter. Notice was also directed to be issued to Respondents 1 and 2 via speed post and email, returnable for 12.01.2022. Later, the matter was clubbed with other similar petitions concerning condonation of delay in filing trademark oppositions. The Court noted an affidavit filed by the Registrar of Trademarks and directed it to be placed on record. The Registrar was asked to clarify whether physical or online filings post-pandemic were entertained despite the lapse of the four-month statutory period. The matter was listed next for 21.03.2022, and officials from the Trade Marks Registry were required to remain present. The petition remains pending, with the core issue revolving around delay in opposition filing and the conduct of the Registry during and after the COVID-19 pandemic period.	**Case Disposed**
12.	W.P.(C) 1907/2022	Soumya Joshi **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks New Delhi & Anr **Respondent**	An initial order on February 1, 2022, allowed exemptions and issued notice to the respondents, with the matter returnable on March 4, 2022. Subsequently, an order dated August 3, 2022, confirmed that W.P.(C) 1907/2022 and its connected applications (CM APPLs. 5485/2022, 11118/2022, 12729/2022) had already been disposed of by an order dated March 31, 2022, and thus are no longer to be listed in the cause list.	**Case Disposed**
13.	W.P.(C)-IPD 12/2022	Mahesh Gupta **Petitioner** *verses* Deputy Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The court noted that the status of the Trademark Application on the E-Register has been reverted to 'Advertised before Acceptance' from its previous 'Sent to readvertisement' status, and the opposition to the application has been withdrawn. As a result, the Petitioner's application is now eligible for registration. Consequently, the writ petition and all associated pending applications were disposed of, with a clear directive that the Respondent	**Case Disposed**

			shall not issue any further or fresh publication concerning the trademark that was the subject of this petition.	
14.	W.P.(C)-IPD 12/2022	Hpg Consulting India Pvt Ltd- **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. **Respondent**	The court noted that the status of the Trademark Application on the E-Register has been reverted to 'Advertised before Acceptance' from its previous 'Sent to readvertisement' status, and the opposition to the application has been withdrawn. As a result, the Petitioner's application is now eligible for registration. Consequently, the writ petition and all associated pending applications were disposed of, with a clear directive that the Respondent shall not issue any further or fresh publication concerning the trademark that was the subject of this petition.	**Case Disposed**
15.	W.P.(C)-IPD 22/2022	Mahesh Gupta **Petitioner** *verses* Deputy Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	The court noted that the status of the Trademark Application on the E-Register has been reverted to 'Advertised before Acceptance' from its previous 'Sent to readvertisement' status, and the opposition to the application has been withdrawn. As a result, the Petitioner's application is now eligible for registration. Consequently, the writ petition and all associated pending applications were disposed of, with a clear directive that the Respondent shall not issue any further or fresh publication concerning the trademark that was the subject of this petition.	**Case Disposed**
16.	W.P.(C)-IPD 26/2022	TKW Fasteners Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks **Respondent**	The court noted that the status of the Trademark Application on the E-Register has been reverted to 'Advertised before Acceptance' from its previous 'Sent to readvertisement' status, and the opposition to the application has been withdrawn. As a result, the Petitioner's application is now eligible for registration. Consequently, the writ petition and all associated pending applications were disposed of, with a clear directive that the Respondent shall not issue any further or fresh publication concerning the trademark that was the subject of this petition.	**Case Disposed**

PROCEDURAL CHALLENGES AND COMPLIANCE ISSUES

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status

1.	C.A. (COMM.IPD -TM) 10/2023	Abu Dhabi Global Market **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	The appellant, Abu Dhabi Global Market, approached the Delhi High Court challenging the action of the Registrar of Trademarks. The court granted exemption to the appellant under I.A. 5132/2023, allowing the filing of clearer copies of any dim or illegible documents within 30 days. In the main matter and related applications (I.A. 5131/2023 seeking stay and I.A. 5177/2023 for filing additional documents), the court issued notice. The respondent, represented by the CGSC, accepted notice in court. The court directed the respondent to file a reply within four weeks and permitted the appellant to file a rejoinder, if any, thereafter.	**Case Disposed**
2.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 153/2021	Elyon Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	Elyon Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. filed an appeal before the Delhi High Court challenging an order of the Registrar of Trademarks. The petitioner submitted an affidavit regarding earlier IPAB orders and attempted to regularize the filing of vakalatnama and board resolution, which were under objection due to defects.	**Case Disposed**
3.	C.A.(COMM .IPDPAT) 48/2022	Vgx Pharmaceuticals Inc **Petitioner** *verses* The Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks **Respondent**	The Joint Registrar (Judicial), Sh. Ashish Aggarwal (DHJS), issued the directive. On September 23, 2021, the "Committee constituted to look into the provisions of the Tribunal Reforms (Rationalisation and Conditions of Service) Ordinance 2021 and make Recommendations" directed that the case be listed for the removal of deficiencies. The court ordered that a copy of the registry's objections be sent to the appellant's attorney and that they be taken down. By the following hearing date, the parties were also required to file certified copies of any orders that had been issued during the pertinent periods and to notify the court of any such orders. The case was scheduled for a follow-up hearing on September 2, 2022.	
4.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-PAT) 47/2022	The Protector And Gamble Company **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General Of Patent, Designs And Trademarks **Respondent**	The Joint Registrar (Judicial), Sh. Ashish Aggarwal, issued the directive on May 11, 2022. Based on the suggestions of a committee established on September 23, 2021, concerning the Tribunal Reforms (Rationalisation and Conditions of Service) Ordinance 2021, the case was listed to rectify flaws. The court ordered both parties to notify the court if any orders had been issued during the pertinent periods and to submit certified copies of such orders, if available, and directed that a copy of the registry's objections be given to the	**Case Disposed**

			appellant's counsel. On September 22, 2022, the matter was scheduled for a follow-up hearing. Joint Registrar (Judicial) Sh. Purshotam Pathak later heard the matter on September 22, 2022, pointing out that the respondent had not received the notice from the IPAB and that the flaws were still unrepaired. The appellant's attorney brought up the fact that prior order sheets were unavailable. The matter was set to be presented to the Hon'ble Court for further guidance on November 18, 2022, with no outstanding flaws. Justice Jyoti Singh ordered on November 18, 2022, that notice be sent to the respondents via all legal channels, and that the matter be returned on March 16, 2023. Additionally, The court dismissed the appeal after the appellant's attorney dropped it.	
5.	W.P.(C)-IPD 25/2023	M/S Mex Switchgears Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademark & Anr. **Respondent**	In the Delhi High Court case of M/S MEX SWITCHGEARS PVT. LTD. vs. THE REGISTRAR OF TRADEMARK & ANR. (W.P.(C)-IPD 25/2023), the Petitioner, represented by Mr. Shailen Bhatia and others, faced procedural complexities including service issues with Respondent No. 2. A significant development was the death of Respondent No. 2, prompting court directions for the Petitioner to address legal representation and for the Registrar of Trademark (Respondent No. 1) to provide clarity on the deceased's trademark status. The right of Respondent No. 2 to file a reply was closed due to non-appearance. The case has seen various adjournments and continues through judicial directives concerning proper legal proceedings.	**Case Pending**
6.	C.A.(COMM .IPDPAT) 487/2022	Otraces Inc. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General Of Patents, Designs & Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	The Court directs that notice be issued in this matter. Mr. Harish Vaidyanathan Shankar, learned counsel, having entered appearance, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents. The respondents are hereby granted a period of four weeks to file their reply or written submissions. Thereafter, the appellant(s) may file any rejoinder or written submissions within a subsequent period of four weeks. On 6th March 2025, Counsel for the appellant submits that they have instructions from the appellant to withdraw the present appeal. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed as withdrawn.	**Case Disposed**

7.	C.A.(COMM .IPDPAT) 493/2022	President And Fellows Of Harvard College **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General Of Patents Designs And Trademarks **Respondent**	The Court directed that notice be issued to the respondent who accepted the notice The Court further directed the respondent to file a reply within four weeks. The appellant was granted an additional four weeks thereafter to file a rejoinder, if any. On 3rd March 2025, learned counsel appearing for the respondent contended that due to the technical nature of the case, it was imperative for the official who passed the impugned order to be heard to explain the technical details. The respondent's counsel further requested that the said official, being based out of Delhi, be permitted to join the proceedings online. Although an attempt was made for the official to join online, a technical glitch prevented their participation during the hearing. Consequently, the Court ordered the matter to be re-notified for July 28, 2025, at 3:00 PM	**Case Pending**
8.	C.A.(COMM .IPDPAT) 66/2022	Spinvox Limited **Petitioner** *verses* The Controllers General Of Patents Designs And Trademarks **Respondent**	The Joint Registrar (Judicial) noted that no stenographer was provided from the pool of Establishment. It was recorded that the petitioner and counsel had been served. The Court directed that objections raised by the registry be cured at the earliest and ordered the registry to file a fresh report. However, on 3rd March 2025, the appeal was dismissed.	**Case Disposed**
9.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 104/2022	Stops Hospitality Private Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The hearing was conducted in a hybrid mode. An interlocutory application, I.A. 6010/2022, seeking exemption, was allowed and disposed of by the Court, subject to all just exceptions. The main appeal was adjourned at the request of the learned counsel for the Appellant. On 25th July 2022, the appeal was withdrawn.	**Case Disposed**
10.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 106/2022	Dr Smita Naram **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks And Ors **Respondent**	The Court directed that the learned counsel for the parties be notified of the objections raised by the registry and that these objections must be removed. Furthermore, the parties were instructed to inform the court whether any orders had been passed during the periods in question and to file certified copies of such orders by the next hearing date if they possessed them. List was supposed to be on 5th March 2025.	**Pending**
11	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 113/2022	ITC Limited Of Virginia House **Petitioner** *verses* The Deputy Registrar Of Trademarks And Ors	Matter is taken up through physical hearing as well as video conferencing. Re-notification on 10 October 2023	**Case Disposed**

		Respondent		
12.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 125/2022	A.O. Smith Corporation **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	It notes that no stenographer was available and that certain documents, specifically IPAB (Intellectual Property Appellate Board) orders, were not on record. The Registry reported that an affidavit concerning these IPAB orders had not yet been filed by the appellant. Additionally, the appellant was required to submit a memorandum of parties with complete email and WhatsApp details. The order directs the appellant to cure these objections raised by the Registry at the earliest and instructs the Registry to file a fresh report. The appeal, under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenged the Senior Examiner's order dated 25th June, 2020, which refused the appellant's application for the trademark "ADVANCED RECOVERY TECHNOLOGY (Logo)" in Class 11 for goods like water treatment and purification equipment . The Examiner had refused the application on the grounds that the mark was devoid of distinctive character, thus falling under Section 9(1)(a) and 9(1)(b) of the Trademarks Act, 1999. The appellant argued that the mark, comprising an artwork, the expression *"Advance Recovery Technology"* and the acronym (ART) was unique and distinctive, and the expression functioned as a registrable slogan/tagline. The Court, presided by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sanjeev Narula, observed that the artwork element was unique and creative. Regarding the slogan *"Advance Recovery Technology"* and its acronym "(ART)," the Court noted that no evidence was presented to show it was common to the trade or descriptive of water treatment products. Considering the mark, the Court found it not to be descriptive or devoid of distinctiveness, rendering the objections under Section 9(1)(a) and (b) unsustainable. Consequently, the appeal was allowed on February 28, 2023. The impugned order was set aside, and the Trademarks Registry was directed to process the application and advertise it within three months. The Court specified that rights in the mark would be restricted to the	**Case Disposed**

			depicted combination of words, the acronym "ART" must be used with the full expression, and no exclusive rights would be granted to the individual words "Advance," "Recovery," or "Technology." These disclaimers are to be reflected in the Trademarks Journal.	
13.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 128/2022	Woco Industrictechnik Gmbh **Petitoner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	This order addresses a petition received from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its abolition. The matter was before the court for the rectification of certain deficiencies, specifically missing order sheets and a memo of parties. As no one appeared on behalf of the petitioner, the court directed that a notice be issued to the petitioner and their counsel for appearance on the next hearing date. The petitioner's counsel was also instructed to file the required memo of parties and any available order sheets before the next hearing. The appeal was later withdrawn on 19th January 2024.	**Case Disposed**
14.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 129/2022	Cococare Products Inc **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks The Trademarks Registry **Respondent**	Cococare Products Inc. filed an appeal challenging the rejection of its trademark application (No. 3634458 in class 3) by the Registrar of Trademarks. On July 5, 2022, Justice Prathiba M. Singh disposed of several interim applications, allowing the Appellant exemptions, permitting the filing of additional documents under the IPD Rules, and extending the time to deposit the prescribed court fee by two weeks. The Appellant argued that of the four marks cited in the examination report, one had been removed from the register, another was under rectification, and a third was under opposition, while also asserting longstanding international and Indian use of the mark since 1969 and commercial use in India since 2014. Notice was issued to the Registrar, with directions for the filing of counter and rejoinder affidavits, and the matter was listed for further hearing. Subsequently, on April 17, 2023, before Justice C. Hari Shankar, counsel for Cococare Products Inc. sought to withdraw the appeal with liberty to re-approach the Court if necessary, and the appeal was accordingly disposed of as withdrawn, preserving the Appellant's right to approach the Court again in the future if required.	**Case Disposed**
15.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 163/2022	Calvin Klein Trademark Trust, Usa **Petitioner** *verses*	On December 21, 2022, Justice C. Hari Shankar of the Delhi High Court heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 163/2022, an appeal by Calvin Klein Trademark Trust, USA. The court condoned a 24-day delay in re-filing the appeal and allowed exemptions for filing dim/unclear	**Case Disposed**

		Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	documents and for the notarized/apostilled power of attorney, subject to later submission of legible copies and a duly notarized/apostilled power of attorney within specified periods. Notice for the appeal was issued to the respondents, returnable on February 24, 2023, with directions for replies and rejoinders to be filed. Subsequently, on January 10, 2025, Justice Mini Pushkarna addressed an application for withdrawal of the appeal (I.A. No. 418/2025). The appellant's counsel informed the court that the trademark (No. 916988), which was the subject of the opposition and the appeal, had lapsed due to non-renewal. Therefore, the appellant sought to withdraw the appeal with leave to take necessary steps in the future if any fresh cause of action arose regarding trademark No. 916988. The court, with no objection from Respondent No. 1, permitted the appellant to withdraw the appeal with the requested leave, and the appeal along with pending applications was dismissed as withdrawn. The previously scheduled hearing date of March 28, 2025, was also cancelled.	
16.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 160/2022	Vending Updates (India) Private Limited **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	On December 9, 2022, Justice C. Hari Shankar of the Delhi High Court heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 160/2022, along with several interlocutory applications (I.A. 20887/2022, I.A. 20888/2022, I.A. 20889/2022, I.A. 20890/2022), filed by Vending Updates (India) Private Limited against the Registrar of Trademarks. The court allowed the exemption application (I.A. 20890/2022). Notice was issued for the main appeal and other applications, and Mr. Harish Vaidyanathan Shankar, the learned Central Government Standing Counsel, accepted the notice on behalf of the respondent. The court directed the respondent to file a reply within four weeks, with the appellant allowed one week thereafter to file a rejoinder. The matter was then listed for further hearing on March 2, 2023.	**Case Disposed**
17.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 29/2022	Emil Lux Gmbh And Co. Kg., Emil-Lux-Strasse 1, 42929 Wermelskirchen,Germany Address For Service In India , Perfexio Legal Attorneys-	On February 7, 2022, Joint Registrar (Judicial) Sh. Ashish Aggarwal heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 29/2022, which was transferred from the IPAB. The court addressed deficiencies as per the Tribunal Reforms Ordinance, 2021, and directed parties to remove objections raised by the registry and file certified copies of any orders passed during the relevant periods. The matter was listed for July 13, 2022.	**Case Disposed**

		At-Law 9655, Sector C, Pocket-9, Vasant Kunj New Delhi-110070	Subsequently, on August 4, 2023, Justice Prathiba M. Singh presided over the case. An adjournment was sought on behalf of the appellant, and the matter was listed for December 13, 2023.	
18.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 5/2022	Capital Ventures Pvt Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	On January 14, 2025, in the High Court of Delhi, an adjournment was granted for C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 5/2022 and its connected matters, involving Capital Ventures Pvt. Ltd. as the Appellant and the Registrar of Trademarks as the Respondent. The respondent's counsel requested the adjournment, citing recent engagement in the matters, to which the appellant's counsel had no objection. A reply affidavit has been filed by the respondent. The case is now scheduled to be listed on April 29, 2025, and the respondent has been granted liberty to obtain a copy of the Court files from the Court Master on a pen drive.	**Case Disposed**
19.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 65/2022	Visage Beauty And Healthcare Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	In the case of C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 65/2022, concerning Visage Beauty and Healthcare Pvt. Ltd. and the Registrar of Trademarks, the Delhi High Court addressed deficiencies in the file received from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following the Tribunals Reforms (Regulation and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021. On February 25, 2022, the court, through videoconferencing, directed the appellant's counsel to address objections raised by the registry via email and to provide certified copies of any past orders if available. Subsequently, on September 14, 2022, it was noted that notice had not been issued to the respondent by the IPAB, and the appellant had filed an affidavit regarding the non-availability of order sheets and the memo of parties. With no other deficiencies remaining, the matter was scheduled to be put before the Hon'ble Court on November 3, 2022, for further directions.	**Case Disposed**
20.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 71/2022	Sri Sai Baba Super Spirituality Hospital Trust **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	In the case of C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 71/2022 and connected matters, involving Shri Sai Baba Super Spirituality Hospital Trust against the Registrar of Trademarks, the Delhi High Court, on April 2, 2025, issued an order to remand the trademark applications for fresh consideration. Initially, on March 8, 2022, the case was relisted due to the Presiding Officer being on leave. Later, the court observed that the notification on which the respondent's earlier orders were	**Case Disposed**

			based was questionable and had not been produced or detailed despite multiple opportunities. Consequently, it was deemed in the interest of justice to send the trademark applications back to the Registrar of Trademarks for a new decision on their merits. The respondent was directed to provide appropriate hearings to the petitioner and their representatives, and to decide the applications within six weeks of receipt. All appeals were disposed of with these directions, and the matter is scheduled to be listed before the Registrar of Trademarks on April 15, 2025.	
21.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 72/2022	Sporty Solutionz Private Ltd **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	In the case of C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 72/2022, involving Sporty Solutionz Private Ltd. against the Registrar of Trademarks, the Delhi High Court addressed procedural issues and granted an adjournment. On March 21, 2022, the court noted several deficiencies, including missing order sheets from various periods (2018 to February 7, 2019, August 5, 2029, and after January 7, 2020), as well as the absence of mobile numbers, email IDs, and the memo of parties for both sides. Court notices were to be issued to both parties and their counsels for rectification of these defects and appearance on May 4, 2022. Later, on May 15, 2025, the learned counsel for the petitioner requested an adjournment due to being unwell, which was not opposed by the respondent's counsel. The case was subsequently renotified for September 3, 2025, with all parties granted liberty to file written synopses, not exceeding six pages, detailing chronological lists of dates and events, relevant documents, and highlighted judgments to support their legal propositions, within four weeks.	**Case Disposed**
22.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 88/2022	Shivani Vig Kapoor And Rushi Tiwari Makker H.No. 136, National Media Centre Nathupur, Gurgaon, Haryana- **Petitioner** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks - **Respondent**	The Delhi High Court issued an order on August 14, 2023, regarding the listing and submission of documents for the appeal[1]. The appeal, which originated from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) after its abolition, had initially presented with deficiencies, including missing order sheets, memo of parties, and contact details for both parties and their counsel, which were noted on March 29, 2022. The appellant's counsel was directed to rectify these deficiencies, and court notice was to be issued to the respondent for a hearing on May 17, 2022. Subsequently, the case was listed for	

			disposal at the end of the Board on December 12, 2023. Both sides were instructed to file brief written submissions, not exceeding four pages, along with duly indexed compilations of any judicial authorities they wished to rely upon, after exchanging copies with each other at least one week in advance of the next hearing.	
23.	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 90/2022	Huntleigh Technology Limited **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar of Trademarks **Respondent**	On 30th March 2022, the matter was listed before the Joint Registrar (Judicial), Ms. Tyagita Singh. However, due to the absence of the Presiding Officer (on leave), the matter was simply renotified for hearing on 8th April 2022, with no substantive proceedings held that day. Subsequently, the matter came up before Hon'ble Mr. Justice Navin Chawla on 22nd September 2022. On this date, the learned counsel for the appellant (Huntleigh Technology Limited) sought permission to withdraw the appeal. The Court granted this request, and accordingly, the appeal was dismissed as withdrawn. Thus, the case concluded without any adjudication on merits, with the appellant choosing to withdraw the appeal voluntarily.	**Case Disposed**
24.	CM(M) 812/2022	Siddhast Intellectual Property Innovations Pvt. Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	The case was heard by Hon'ble Mr. Justice C. Hari Shankar on 18th August 2022. The petition was filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, challenging an order related to intellectual property rights proceedings. During the hearing, the Court noted that to proceed with the matter under Article 227, the petitioner needed to establish how the case was maintainable despite binding precedents from the Supreme Court in *SBP & Co. v. Patel Engineering Ltd.* [(2005) 8 SCC 618] and *Bhaven Construction v. Executive Engineer Sardar Sarovar Narmada Ltd.* [(2022) 1 SCC 75], as well as a recent ruling by the same Bench in *Easy Trip Planners Ltd. v. One97 Communications Ltd.* [2022 SCC OnLine Del 2186]. To allow the petitioner's counsel time to address these concerns and justify the maintainability of the petition, the matter was adjourned and listed for further hearing on 22nd August 2022. No final decision on merits was made in this order.	**Case Disposed**
25.	C.O. (COMM.IPD -TM) 144/2022	Bennett, Coleman And Company Limited Times Of India Building Dr. D.N. Road Mumbai-	The matter arose as a petition transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) after its abolition following the promulgation of the Tribunals Reforms (Rationalization and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021. On 9th February 2022, the	**Case Disposed**

		4000001, Maharashtra **Petitioner** *verses* Fashion One Television LLC 820 Meridian Ave., Suite 100, Miami Beach, Florida 33139, Usa And The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	case came up before Joint Registrar (Judicial) Ms. Vandana Jain, who clarified that the deficiencies flagged by the Registry pertained to a different IPAB matter (OA/103/2019/TM/DEL). The Registry was directed to verify if any deficiencies existed in the present case. Court notice was ordered to be issued to the respondents, returnable on 17th May 2022. Subsequently, the matter was listed before Hon'ble Mr. Justice C. Hari Shankar on 6th November 2023. However, due to lack of time, the matter could not be heard, and it was adjourned and re-notified for 18th December 2023. Thus, the proceedings are ongoing, with no substantive decision having been rendered yet. The case concerns trademark matters involving major media entities and is part of the transition from IPAB to High Court jurisdiction under the new regulatory framework.	
26.	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 268/2022	Ganapati Tobacco Pvt. Ltd **Petitoner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr **Respondent**	The case concerns trademark proceedings initiated by the petitioner. On 4th March 2022, the matter came before Joint Registrar (Judicial) Sharad Gupta for rectification of procedural deficiencies. The Registry had noted several missing documents, including order sheets from 2018 to February 2019 and from later dates, as well as the absence of original order sheets and contact details of both parties. The learned counsels assured the Court that they would file a fresh memo of parties with complete contact details and would inspect the file to provide the missing order sheets, if available. The matter was adjourned for curing these defects and re-listed for 21st April 2022. Subsequently, the case appeared along with several connected matters on 15th April 2025 before Hon'ble Mr. Justice Saurabh Banerjee. On this date, the petitioner's counsel moved an adjournment slip with no objection from the respondents. Consequently, the Court adjourned the matter and directed that it be re-listed on 5th August 2025, with instructions that a copy of the order be placed in all connected matters. The case remains pending, primarily at a procedural stage, with no decision yet on substantive issues.	**Case Disposed**

27.	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 384/2022	M/S. Meenu Electric Company **Petitioner** *verses* M/S. Dynamic Electricals And The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	On December 3, 2024, the High Court of Delhi addressed this matter and connected matters, including C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 384/2022. The case involves M/S. Meenu Electric Company as the Petitioner/Plaintiff against M/S. Golden Cab Industries (in C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 380/2022) and M/S. Dynamic Electricals and The Registrar of Trademarks (in C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 384/2022) as Respondents/Defendants. During the hearing, presided over by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amit Bansal, counsel for the petitioner requested an adjournment. Additionally, counsel for the Registrar of Trademarks also sought an adjournment, citing that the matter had only recently been assigned to them. The court granted the adjournments, and the matter is now listed for the next hearing on March 21, 2025. An earlier order from March 24, 2022, had noted that the presiding officer was on leave and the matter was re-notified for April 11, 2022.	**Case Pending**
28.	C.O. (COMM.IPD -TM) 476/2022	Ganapati Tobacco Pvt Ltd. **Petitioner** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	This brief concerns C.O. 476/2022, among other connected matters, with Ganpati Tobacco Pvt Ltd. as the Petitioner/Appellant and the Registrar of Trademarks and another entity as Respondents. An earlier order on July 15, 2022, had noted that the presiding officer was on leave and the matter was listed for September 26, 2022. In the latest proceeding on April 15, 2025, before Hon'ble Mr. Justice Saurabh Banerjee, the counsel for the petitioner submitted an adjournment slip, which was accepted without objection from both defendant numbers 1 and 2. Consequently, all connected matters, including C.O. 476/2022, are now listed for further proceedings on August 5, 2025.	

ABSOLUTE GROUND FOR REFUSAL (SECTION 9)

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 123/2021	Cfa Institute **Appellant** *verses* Deputy Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The CFA Institute filed an appeal under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 challenging the order and Statement of Grounds, by which the Registrar of Trademarks had refused their application for registration of the mark "CHARTERED FINANCIAL ANALYST". The refusal was based on absolute grounds under Section 9(1)(a) and (b) of the Act, citing lack of distinctiveness and the descriptive nature of the mark. The appellant contended	**Case Disposed**

			that the mark "CHARTERED FINANCIAL ANALYST" had acquired a secondary meaning due to long-standing use, and placed reliance on the 2006 judgment in *Association for Investment Management & Research v. ICFAI*. The Court noted that the appellant already held a valid registration for an identical mark under another application and found the objections raised under Section 9 to be unsustainable. Accordingly, allowed the appeal, set aside the Registrar's refusal, and directed the Trademark Registry to process the application and advertise the mark within three months. The Court clarified that no exclusive rights would vest in the expression "Financial Analyst" and this disclaimer should be reflected during advertisement and registration.	
2	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 123/2022	Shivank Dalmia **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademark **Respondent**	The appellant, engaged in the manufacture and sale of skincare and wellness products under the trademark "REJUVENATING UBTAN HANDCRAFTED IN INDIA", challenged the rejection of his trademark application for products such as herbal cosmetics, soaps, and essential oils. The Senior Examiner had refused registration citing Section 9(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, stating that the mark was descriptive and lacked distinctiveness, and no evidence of acquired distinctiveness had been provided. One of the key grounds of appeal was the violation of natural justice the appellant claimed he was not afforded a hearing prior to the rejection. The respondent contested this but did not object to the Court granting a fresh hearing. The Delhi High Court, noting that the appellant already had a related registration and had been using the mark commercially, found merit in the argument. It set aside the impugned order and directed the Registrar to grant a fresh hearing within four months. The Court clarified it had not examined the merits of the trademark application itself.	**Case Disposed**
3	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 6/2022 & C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 7/2022	Indian Oncology Foundation **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The Indian Oncology Foundation, a charitable trust dedicated to cancer management, filed an appeal against the rejection of its trademark application for the name "Indian Oncology Foundation". The application, filed in 2017, was rejected by the Registrar of Trademarks in February 2021 under Sections 9(1)(a) and 9(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, for being non-distinctive and descriptive. The Registrar held that the mark consisted of generic words	**Case Disposed**

			directly describing the nature of services and lacked inherent distinctiveness. The appellant argued that the mark was coined and had acquired distinctiveness through continuous use since 2007. However, the court found that the supporting documents submitted (such as invoices, trust deed, and PAN) were insufficient to demonstrate acquired distinctiveness or secondary meaning. The High Court upheld the rejection, noting the absence of evidence like advertising expenditure or territorial extent of use and dismissed the appeal, though allowing the appellant to reapply in future with sufficient evidence.	
4	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 130/2022	Krishna E-Commerce Technologies Private Limited **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademark **Respondent**	On July 5, 2022, Justice Navin Chawla issued a notice to the respondent, returnable on October 13, 2022, and dismissed an application (I.A. 9957/2022) as not pressed. Subsequently, on December 7, 2022, Justice Sanjeev Narula presided over the case, which also included I.A. 9958/2022. The appellant challenged a refusal order dated December 17, 2021, by the Senior Examiner of Trademarks, which rejected the registration of the "LensBazaar" device mark in class 35. The Senior Examiner had objected under Section 9(1)(b) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, stating that "LensBazaar" was highly descriptive and indicated the service of sale and purchase of lenses. The appellant argued that they adopted "LensBazaar" in 2009, obtained registration for a similar mark in class 10 in 2010, and began business activities, including the sale of eyewear, under the mark in 2012. They contended that the mark had acquired a secondary meaning and that the Senior Examiner failed to consider documents supporting this and a prior registration of a similar mark in class 10. The High Court noted that the impugned order did not consider the appellant's prior registration of a similar trademark in class 10. The court found that "LensBazaar," a combination of "Lens" and "Bazaar," is a coined word, and its combination does not have an instant connection to the nature of the products sold, thus not falling under Section 9(1)(b) as descriptive. Given the continuous use of the mark, the court determined that the appellant should have an opportunity to demonstrate its distinctiveness. Accordingly, the High Court set aside the refusal order dated December 17, 2021, and directed the Registrar of Trademarks to proceed	**Case Disposed**

			with the registration of the "LensBazaar" mark. The advertisement of the mark is to be carried out within three months. The court clarified that the appellant's rights are restricted to "LensBazaar" as a combination, with no exclusive rights to the words "Lens" or "Bazaar" individually. This disclaimer must be reflected during advertisement and if the mark proceeds to registration. The appeal was disposed of along with pending applications. The Registry was directed to provide a copy of the order to the Registrar of Trademarks for compliance.	
5	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 47/2022	Fluke Corporation, 6920 Seaway Boulevard Everett, Washington 98203, Usa **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks, Boudhik Sampada Bhavan, Plot No. 32, Sector-14, Dwarka, New Delhi **Respondent**	This appeal, filed by Fluke Corporation under Section 91(1) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, challenges an order from December 10, 2018, issued by the Registrar of Trademarks. The impugned order rejected Fluke Corporation's trademark application number 2354325, dated June 26, 2012, for the mark 'DATAPAQ' in Class 9. The rejection was based on Section 9(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, which states that the mark is descriptive of the goods and services. Counsel for the Appellant, Mr. Pravin Anand, stated that the goods for which the mark is intended are temperature systems and temperature profiling[4]. The court noted that the current description of goods in the application is broad[5]. As a suggestion from the court, the Appellant's counsel indicated that his client might be willing to restrict the goods. Consequently, the Appellant is directed to file a short statement providing a more restrictive description of the goods in the application for the court's consideration[7]. The matter is listed for further proceedings on August 16, 2023.	**Case Disposed**

GROUNDS FOR APPEAL AND IPAB

S.no	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	C.A.(COMM .IPDPAT) 88/2022	Synthes Gmbh- **Appellant** *verses* Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	This order pertains to an appeal received by the High Court of Delhi from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its abolition and the promulgation of the Tribunals Reforms (Rationalization and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021. The learned counsel for the appellant, Synthes GMBH, submitted that this was a fresh appeal and no hearing had taken place before the IPAB. The counsel requested that the matter be placed before the Hon'ble Court for further directions. Further, it	**Case Disposed**

			criticizes the impugned order (presumably from the patent office) for stating that the appellant's oral and written submissions were considered, but then declaring, without any reasoning, that the appellant's claim did not comply with Section 2(1)(j) of the Patents Act. It further notes that the impugned order merely reiterated the objection from the First Examination Report (FER)	
2	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 134/2022	Valverde Norambuena Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The petition was received from the IPAB after its abolition. The court noted deficiencies, specifically the absence of an order sheet dated January 22, 2020. A court notice was issued to the respondent for appearance on the next date, as none had appeared on behalf of the respondent previously. The appellant's counsel stated that the previous order sheets were not available with the appellant. The case was set to be put before the Hon'ble Court on November 21, 2022, for further directions. On March 24, 2023, Justice Sanjeev Narula of the Delhi High Court heard the appeal. The appellant challenged an order dated December 20, 2018, and a Statement of Grounds of Decision dated February 21, 2019, by the Senior Examiner, which refused the registration of their device mark "BLACK B BLUE" under Class 25 for "Child Costume"[2]. The refusal was based on Section 11(1)(a) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, citing phonetic similarity with conflicting marks. The appellant's counsel presented documents showing the status of the cited conflicting marks. It was revealed that several cited marks had either lapsed due to non-renewal, been refused, or abandoned. The only remaining cited mark was a device mark "Blue & Blue". The court compared this with the appellant's subject mark, "BLACK B BLUE," and found them to be prima facie dissimilar. Consequently, the High Court set aside the impugned order and allowed the appellant's subject mark to proceed for registration. The court directed that the mark be advertised within three months. Any future opposition would be decided on its own merits, uninfluenced by the court's observations. It was clarified that the appellant would only be entitled to use "BLACK B BLUE" as a composite mark and could not claim exclusive rights to the words "BLACK" or "BLUE" individually. This	**Case Disposed**

			disclaimer must be reflected in the Trade Marks Journal during advertisement and upon registration. The appeal was disposed of with these directions, and the Registry was instructed to send a copy of the order to the Trademarks Registry for compliance.	
3	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 140/2022	Romsons Scientific And Surgical Industries Pvt Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Asst. Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	The case was transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) after its abolition. The court noted the absence of both the appellant, Romsons Scientific and Surgical Industries Pvt Ltd, and the respondents, Asst. Registrar of Trademarks and Anr. The Registry was directed to email deficiencies to the petitioner, and court notices were to be issued to both parties. Parties were instructed to remove all defects, and the Registry was to file a fresh report regarding any remaining deficiencies. The matter was listed for appearance of parties and removal of defects on October 28, 2022. On May 13, 2024, Justice Sanjeev Narula of the Delhi High Court reviewed the case. A report from the Joint Registrar dated March 22, 2024, indicated that the appellant had been served but had not appeared or removed deficiencies, despite their Trademark agent also being served. Respondent No. 1 had appeared through counsel previously[7]. However, Respondent No. 2 could not be served despite repeated efforts, with reports indicating "no such person" at the given addresses, and their counsel refusing notice stating they no longer represented Respondent No. 2. Given that neither the appellant was appearing, nor Respondent No. 2 could be served, the court found it difficult to proceed with the petition. As a result, the appeal was dismissed in default and for non-prosecution.	**Case Disposed**
4	C.A.(COMM .IPD-TM) 36/2022	S And P Global Inc. (Formely Known As Mcgraw Hill Financial, Inc.) 55 Water Street, New York, New York 10041, Usa **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademark **Respondent**	On February 9, 2022, Joint Registrar (Judicial) Ms. Surya Malik Grover of the Delhi High Court heard C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 36/2022, which had been transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its abolition. The court noted deficiencies in the file and directed the petitioner to rectify them as per the office report. Court notices were ordered to be issued to both parties and their counsels, along with a note of the defects, with directions to contact the Registry for rectification. The matter was then listed for further proceedings on June 3, 2022.	**Case Disposed**

			Subsequently, on April 17, 2023 (corrected and released on April 24, 2023), Justice Sanjeev Narula allowed the appeal filed by S&P Global Inc. under Section 91 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, challenging the refusal order dated December 28, 2018, for their multi-class trademark application "Essential Intelligence" (Classes 09, 16, 35, 36, 40, and 41). The refusal was based on the mark being considered laudatory, descriptive, and generic. The court found the refusal orders to be devoid of merit and set them aside. The Trade Marks Registry was directed to process the registration application for the subject mark and advertise it within three months. Any future opposition would be decided on its own merits. The court clarified that the appellant's rights in the mark would be restricted to the combination of words "Essential" and "Intelligence," with no exclusive rights to either word separately. This disclaimer was to be reflected in the Trade Marks Journal during advertisement and if the mark proceeds to registration. The appeal was disposed of with these directions.	
5	C.A.(COMM .IPDTM) 76/2022	Tablets (India) Limited Represented By Its Authorized Signatory Mr. T. Sathish **Appellant** *verses* M/S. Spey Medicals Private Limited And The Registrar Of Trademarks (New Delhi) **Respondent**	The Delhi High Court initially addressed the rectification of defects in the file transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB). On March 10, 2022, the court noted several missing documents, including order sheets and the memo of parties, as well as missing mobile numbers and email IDs for both parties, and directed the plaintiff's counsel to rectify these issues. It was also observed that the defendant had not appeared in the IPAB before the matter's transfer, and court notice was to be issued to the defendant by all permissible modes, including electronic. Subsequently, on May 8, 2025, the learned counsel for both parties submitted that they had filed their respective written synopses, though these were not yet on record. The court directed that these synopses be brought on record, subject to any objections, and renotified the matter for July 23, 2025.	**Case Disposed**
6	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 166/2022	Basant Lal Proprietor Of The Trademarks L And K Waterman Since1948 1-2 Krishan Nagar,	The case pertains to a trademark rectification petition concerning the mark "L and K Waterman." The petition was transferred from the erstwhile Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) after its abolition under the Tribunals Reforms (Rationalization and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021. On	**Case Disposed**

		Mathura, Uttar Pradesh **Appellant** *verses* Sushma Rani Arora Registered Proprietor Of The Impugned Trademark L And K 1-2 E, Krishna Nagar, 3 Arhera, Mathura Uttar Pradesh **Respondent**	14th February 2022, the matter came up before Joint Registrar (Judicial) Ms. Vandana Jain, who noted that the case appeared to be a fresh rectification petition with no existing order sheet from IPAB. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the matter had never been heard before IPAB. The case was then listed for directions before the Hon'ble Court on 6th May 2022. Later, the matter was taken up by Hon'ble Mr. Justice C. Hari Shankar on 13th July 2023, where it was submitted that the dispute between the parties was on the verge of settlement, with the terms being finalized. Consequently, the case was adjourned and re-notified for 19th September 2023, allowing the parties time to conclude the settlement process. Thus, the proceedings remain pending, with the possibility of resolution through mutual settlement.	
6	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 280/2022	Travelodge Hotels India (Ip) Pte. Ltd **Appellant** *verses* Travelodge Hotels Limited And The Registrar Of Trademarks **Respondent**	The matter was listed before the Joint Registrar (Judicial), Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, on 7th March 2022 for the removal of procedural deficiencies. The case had been transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its dissolution under the Tribunal Reforms (Rationalisation and Conditions of Service) Ordinance, 2021, and was listed in accordance with the directions issued by a committee constituted to review such transferred cases. The Joint Registrar directed that the learned counsel for the parties be notified of the objections raised by the Registry and instructed them to remove the deficiencies. Additionally, the parties were asked to inform the Court whether any orders had been passed during the relevant period and to file certified copies of such orders, if available. The matter was adjourned and listed next for 21st July 2022, with no substantive arguments addressed at this stage.	**Case Disposed**
7	C.O. (COMM.IPD TM) 442/2022	Ganapati Tobacco Pvt Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks And Anr **Respondent**	This brief pertains to multiple connected cases, including C.O. (COMM.IPD-TM) 442/2022, all involving Ganpati Tobacco Pvt. Ltd. as the Petitioner/Appellant against The Registrar of Trademarks and another respondent. These cases were transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) following its abolition. An earlier order on April 4, 2022, noted deficiencies in the file and directed the counsel	**Case Disposed**

			for the respondent to inspect and rectify them, listing the matter for May 12, 2022. In the latest proceeding on April 15, 2025, before Hon'ble Mr. Justice Saurabh Banerjee, the counsel for the petitioner moved an adjournment slip, which was met with no objection from both defendant numbers 1 and 2. Consequently, the court listed all connected matters for further proceedings on August 5, 2025.	
8	C.O. (COMM.IPD -TM) 661/2022	Jsw Ip Holdings Pvt Ltd. **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks And Ors **Respondent**	A rectification petition was filed by JSW IP Holdings Pvt Ltd. against the Registrar of Trademarks and others. Initially, on May 26, 2022, the case was noted to have been transferred from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) after its abolition, and the court identified several deficiencies in the submitted file, including missing order sheets and a memo of parties; the plaintiff's counsel was directed to rectify these issues, and the case was listed for September 22, 2022. More recently, in an order dated March 6, 2025, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amit Bansal noted that counsel for respondent numbers 2 to 4 intended to file an application for additional documents, and at their request, the matter has been re-notified for August 19, 2025.	**Case Disposed**
9	C.A.(COMM .IPD- PAT) 149/2022	T-Mobile International Ag And Co. Kg. Through Mr. Tanmay Joshi, Constituted Attorney **Appellant** *verses* The Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks And Anr. Advocate :Rohit Rangi, Remfry And Sagar **Respondent**	This brief outlines the case *T-Mobile International AG & Co. KG. vs. The Controller General of Patents* (C.A.(COMM.IPD-PAT) 149/2022) before the Delhi High Court. The central issue was the maintainability of the appeal, which was transferred from the abolished IPAB. Respondents argued a prior appeal was abandoned due to defects. However, on January 24, 2025, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amit Bansal ruled the current appeal was maintainable, as a fresh appeal had been filed without subsequent objections. Procedurally, the respondents' right to file a formal reply was closed for failing to clear objections, with their existing written submissions treated as their reply. The case, after an earlier cancellation, is now listed for October 15, 2025.	**Case Pending**

INTERPRETATION OF TRADE MARKS RULES, 2017(RULE 158)

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	LPA 429/2023	Mahesh Gupta **Appellant** *verses* Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. Advocate :Ankur Sangal **Respondent**	In *Mahesh Gupta v. Registrar of Trademarks & Anr.* (LPA 429/2023), the High Court of Delhi's Special Bench clarified the retrospective application of the Trademarks Rules, 2017, to proceedings initiated under the 2002 Rules. The Court meticulously addressed whether new provisions, including those for deemed abandonment (Rules 45 & 46 of 2017), would affect prior actions, interpreting Rule 158 to preserve *"liabilities incurred or irreversible consequences"*. This pivotal judgment, pronounced on March 13, 2024, concluded that the 2017 Rules would not retroactively negate such consequences, leading to the dismissal of the appeal.	**Case Disposed**

OPPOSITION PROCEEDINGS RULE 45

S. No	Case No.	Parties	Brief	Status
1.	W.P.(C)-IPD 22/2023	XYZ Digital Private Limited **Appellant** *verses* The Registrar Of Trademarks & Anr. Advocate :Pulkit Thareja **Respondent**	XYZ Digital Private Limited (Petitioner), represented by Mr. Pulkit Thareja, initiated W.P.(C)-IPD 22/2023 challenging an opposition to their 'HISOURCE' trademark, arguing for its abandonment under **Rule 45(2) of the Trade Mark Rules, 2017,** due to Respondent No. 2's failure to file evidence as per **Rule 45(1).** Initially, Justice Sanjeev Narula disposed of the writ petition as "infructuous" on January 9, 2024, after the Trademark Registry issued a hearing notice regarding the abandonment. However, due to the Registrar's inaction, the Petitioner sought to revive the petition via CM 29/2025. On February 27, 2025, Justice Amit Bansal noted that a hearing had occurred, and the Petitioner was instructed to upload their complete counter-statement, leading to the disposal of the revival application and continuation of the trademark proceedings.	**Case Disposed**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This compendium is the result of a collaborative effort by the dedicated team at Lexport. We extend our sincere appreciation to Ms. Rajlatha Kotni (Partner) and Ms. Swagita Pandey for analysis of cases. Special thanks to Ms. Manasvi Vaid (Intern) from Symbiosis Law School, Noida, for her meticulous research and drafting support.

DISCLAIMER

This compendium is intended solely for informational and academic purposes. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and currency of the content, the publishers do not guarantee its completeness or correctness, and accept no liability for any errors, omissions, or subsequent changes in law or judicial interpretation. Certain cases summarized herein may be subject to appeal, review, or other proceedings that could alter the outcomes reported. This document does not constitute legal advice, and no attorney–client relationship is created by its use.