

IPR Law Judgments

A Monthly Wrap | **June 2026** 



Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Orders Removal of 'PONTA' Trademark, Citing Confusion with Panasonic's 'PENTA' Mark. <i>Panasonic Holdings Corporation and Ors. vs. Siddharth Vij and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4400/2026; 2026: DHC:5074)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Panasonic Holdings Corporation and Siddharth Vij regarding the trademark 'PONTA', registered by Vij, which Panasonic claimed was deceptively similar to its own 'PENTA' mark. The court found that Panasonic had established substantial goodwill with 'PENTA' since 1989, while Vij's 'PONTA' was registered without sufficient cause and was likely to cause confusion. The court ordered the removal of 'PONTA' from the Trademarks Register, directing the Registrar to rectify the entries within four weeks, thus granting relief to Panasonic.
'GLASS SKIN' Describes Product Effect, Not Brand Identity: Delhi High Court <i>Renee Cosmetics Private Limited vs. Rupali Sharma and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4399/2026; 2026: DHC:5075)	The High Court of Delhi addressed whether the trademark 'GLASS SKIN' registered by Rupali Sharma was descriptive or suggestive. Renee Cosmetics Private Limited argued that 'GLASS SKIN' is a descriptive term widely used in the cosmetics industry, thus non-registrable. The court found that the term is indeed descriptive, as it conveys the intended purpose and effect of the products, and lacks secondary significance. Consequently, the court directed the Registrar of Trademarks to cancel and remove the registration of 'GLASS SKIN' from the register. No costs were ordered, and related applications were disposed of.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
No Contempt Made Out Against Google in ‘AGGARWAL PACKERS AND MOVERS’ Trademark Case <i>DRS Logistics (P) Ltd. and Ors. vs. Google India Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4431/2026: 2026: DHC:5102)	The High Court of Delhi dismissed a contempt petition alleging violation of earlier trademark orders concerning the marks “AGARWAL” and “AGGARWAL PACKERS AND MOVERS.” The Court held that Google’s obligation was limited to investigating complaints regarding trademark use as keywords and removing infringing advertisements where necessary. Reaffirming that keyword advertising is not per se for trademark infringement, the Court emphasized that liability depends on consumer confusion, passing off, or dilution, and found no willful non-compliance by Google.
Delhi HC Refuses Assignee’s Substitution in ‘DOUBLE KABOOTAR BRAND’ Dispute, Emphasizes Transparency in Trademark Assignments. <i>Anuj Bindal vs. Union of India and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4428/2026: 2026: DHC:5103)	The High Court of Delhi refused to substitute an assignee as respondent in a trademark rectification petition involving the mark “DOUBLE KABOOTAR BRAND.” The Court held that the assignment of the trademark during the pendency of rectification proceedings raised serious doubts regarding its bona fides, particularly as the transfer was made to the registered proprietor’s wife. Since the application to record the assignment before the Trademarks Registry remained pending, the assignee had not yet acquired legal proprietorship and could not be substituted in the proceedings. The Court emphasized the importance of transparency and procedural compliance in trademark assignments during ongoing disputes.
Delhi HC Awards Damages and Interest in Steelbird–Global Fragrances Contract Dispute <i>Steelbird Hi-Tech India Ltd. vs. Global Fragrances Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4402/2026; 2026: DHC:5073)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Steelbird Hi-Tech India Ltd. and Global Fragrances Pvt. Ltd. and others regarding a breach of contract for manufacturing and marketing products under Steelbird’s trademarks. Steelbird sought a summary judgment for the recovery of Rs. 4.68 crore, including damages and interest, due to the defendants’ failure to launch products as agreed. The court found that the defendants had no real prospect of defending the claim, as they failed to comply with court orders and did not file a reply. Consequently, the court granted Steelbird a decree for the refund of Rs. 2 crore with 18% interest and additional damages, dismissing the defendants’ defenses

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Holds Interactive Online Listings Can Confer Territorial Jurisdiction in Trademark Suits <i>Astral Ltd. vs. Astral Marketing Syndicate and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4432/2026: 2026: DHC:5101)	The High Court of Delhi held that online listings of allegedly infringing products on interactive platforms such as Justdial can confer territorial jurisdiction in trademark infringement suits. Applying to the principles governing internet jurisdiction, the Court observed that accessible and interactive online listings capable of facilitating commercial transactions give rise to a part of the cause of action. The Court further held that the plaintiff's subordinate office in Delhi, coupled with the online availability of the impugned products, was sufficient to invoke jurisdiction under the Act.
Delhi HC Cancels 'D-TAN' Trademark, Holding Descriptive Terms Cannot Be Monopolised. <i>Honasa Consumer Ltd. vs. Visage Beauty and Health Care Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4465/2026: 2026: DHC:5148)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of whether the trademark 'D-TAN' registered by Visage Beauty and Health Care Pvt. Ltd. was descriptive and thus not eligible for trademark protection. Honasa Consumer Ltd. sought rectification of this trademark, arguing it was a common trade term for products removing tanned skin. The court found 'D-TAN' to be descriptive and lacking distinctiveness, as it merely described the product's purpose. Consequently, the court ordered the cancellation of the 'D-TAN' trademark registration, directing the Registrar of Trademarks to rectify the register within four weeks.
Delhi HC Dismisses Cooler Design Infringement Claim Over Prior Publication, Allows Passing Off Action to Proceed. <i>Novamax Industries LLP vs. Prem Appliances and Ors</i> (MANU/DE/4466/2026: 2026: DHC:5149)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Novamax Industries LLP and Prem Appliances and others regarding alleged infringement and passing off of a registered cooler design. The core issue was whether Novamax's design was validly registered, given evidence of prior publication and sales. The court found that the design was publicly available before registration, rendering the infringement claim unsustainable. However, the court allowed the passing off claim to proceed, as it requires evidence beyond registration. The suit design infringement was dismissed, but the passing off claim remains for trial. The court referenced the Carlsberg Breweries and Crocs Inc. USA cases, affirming that a composite suit for infringement and passing off is maintainable.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Upholds Rejection of Patent for Herbal Asthma Composition, Citing Traditional Knowledge <i>Shaafi Naturcure LLP vs. Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs</i> (MANU/DE/4476/2026 2026: DHC:5157)	The High Court of Delhi upheld the rejection of a patent application for herbal composition for treating asthma. The Court held that the claimed formulation lacked inventive step, as all six herbal ingredients were traditionally known for treating asthma and their combination constituted an obvious aggregation of traditional knowledge under Section 3(p) of the Patents Act. The Court further ruled that post-filing affidavit evidence could not cure deficiencies in the complete specification, reaffirming that patentability must be assessed based on the original disclosure.
Delhi HC Bars ‘THE GLENWALK GODFATHER’S’, Citing Similarity with Well-Known ‘GODFATHER’ Mark <i>Devans Modern Breweries Limited vs. Cartel Bros Private Limited and Ors.</i> (MANU/DE/4477/2026 2026: DHC:5156)	The High Court of Delhi granted an interim injunction restraining the defendants from using the mark “GODFATHER’S” for whisky under the composite mark “THE GLENWALK GODFATHER’S.” The Court held that “GODFATHER” was the dominant and essential feature of the plaintiff’s well-known registered trademark and that its incorporation in the defendant’s mark was likely to cause consumer confusion and dilute the plaintiff’s goodwill. The Court further clarified that the anti-dissection rule cannot shield a composite mark where its prominent feature is deceptively similar to a registered trademark
Bombay HC Holds ‘UTSAHA’ Label Infringing, Upholds Interim Protection for ‘UMANG’ <i>Anil Srichand Kundnani vs. Pruthvi Ishwar Patel and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4667/2026; 2026: BHC-OS-12554)	The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between Anil Srichand Kundnani and Pruthvi Ishwar Patel and others regarding the alleged infringement of Kundnani's copyright in the “UMANG” label mark and passing off by Patel's use of a similar “UTSAHA” label. The court found that the artworks were deceptively similar, with Patel's label being a slavish reproduction of Kundnani's original work. Despite Patel's arguments challenging Kundnani's ownership and the validity of the copyright registration, the court upheld the interim relief granted earlier, restraining Patel from using the impugned label. The court emphasized the substantial similarity and the likelihood of confusion, making the interim application absolute in favor of Kundnani.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Bombay HC Holds Patent Office Cannot Raise Fresh Objections Following Limited Remand Order. <i>Qualyst Transporter Solutions LLC vs. The Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs</i> (MANU/MH/4882/2026: 8-IA-1778-2026)	The High Court of Bombay held that, following a remand order in patent prosecution proceedings, the Patent Office could not introduce entirely new objections or prior art references. The Court clarified that the remand was limited to curing a procedural defect arising from a violation of natural justice and did not permit reopening the examination process de novo. The decision underscores that patent authorities must strictly adhere to the scope of remand orders while ensuring fairness in patent examination proceedings.
Bombay HC Restrains Use of 'BON K2 FORTE', Citing Public Health Risks and Trademark Infringement. <i>Integrace Private Limited vs. Mas Pharmachem and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4904/2026: 1-COMP-238-2025)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off between Integrace Private Limited and Mas Pharmachem and others. Integrace claimed that Mas Pharmachem's use of the mark 'BON K2 FORTE' was deceptively similar to its registered trademark 'BON - K2', used for medicinal products. The court found that the defendants' mark was virtually identical and likely to cause confusion, especially given the public health implications of pharmaceutical products. The court decreed in favor of Integrace, granting an injunction against the defendants and ordering them to pay costs of Rs. 1,00,000 each, citing the defendants' failure to defend the suit and their dishonest conduct.
Bombay HC Restrains 'ZENOX', Citing Deceptive Similarity with Glenmark's 'ZINOX' and Stricter Standards for Medicinal Marks. <i>Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Limited vs. Zenlabs India and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4905/2026: 2-COMIP-535-2016)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off between Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Limited and Zenlabs India and others. Glenmark claimed that Zenlabs' use of the mark 'ZENOX' was deceptively similar to its registered trademark 'ZINOX', both used for medicinal products, potentially causing consumer confusion. The court found in favor of Glenmark, noting the visual and phonetic similarities between the marks and Zenlabs' lack of defense. The court granted a permanent injunction against Zenlabs, awarded costs of Rs. 5,00,000 to Glenmark and emphasized the stricter standards for medicinal products.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Unreasoned Post-Grant Patent Revocation Quashed by Bombay High Court <i>SAATHI, Inc. vs. Office of The Controller General of Patents, Designs, and Trademarks and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4926/2026: 2026: BHC: OS:13304)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the challenge by SAATHI, Inc. against the Office of The Controller General of Patents, Designs, and Trademarks, which revoked SAATHI's patent based on post-grant opposition. The court found the revocation in order to be unreasoned, lacking independent analysis, and failing to address key issues such as the locus of the opposing party and the absence of an affidavit of evidence. The court emphasized the necessity for a reasoned decision, especially when deviating from the Opposition Board's recommendations. Consequently, the court allowed the petition, setting aside the revocation order.
Bombay HC Quashes Counterfeit Goods Case, Holds Trademark Infringement Cannot Be Prosecuted Under Copyright Act. <i>Sandip and Ors. vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4899/2026: 2026: BHC-NAG: 7651-DB)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of whether Sandip and others could be prosecuted under Sections 51 and 63 of the Copyright Act, 1957, for allegedly selling counterfeit goods of brands Zara and Calvin Klein. The court found that the allegations pertained to trademark infringement, not copyright infringement, as the goods did not fall under the categories protected by copyright law. Additionally, the search and seizure were conducted improperly by a Police Sub-Inspector, violating the Trademarks Act, 1999. Consequently, the court quashed the FIR, charge-sheet, and criminal proceedings against the applicants.
Bombay HC Holds Rule 45 Deadline for Trademark Evidence Affidavits Is Directory, Not Mandatory <i>Black Diamond Motors Pvt. Ltd. vs. Registrar of Trade Marks, Mumbai and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4919/2026: 2026:BHC-OS:13254)	The High Court of Bombay addressed whether the deadline in Rule 45 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, for filing an Evidence Affidavit is mandatory or directory. The parties involved were Black Diamond Motors Pvt. Ltd. and the Registrar of Trade Marks, Mumbai, among others. The court reasoned that Rule 45 is directory, not mandatory, allowing the Registrar discretion to extend deadlines under Section 131 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. The court dismissed the appeal, upholding the Registrar's order to accept a late Evidence Affidavit, and found no need for interference, emphasizing procedural flexibility to ensure justice.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Bombay HC Restrains ‘MEFIAL-SPAS’, Citing Deceptive Similarity with Blue Cross’s ‘MEFTAL-SPAS’ Mark. <i>Blue Cross Laboratories Private Limited vs. Alto Healthcare Private Limited and Ors.</i> (MANU/MH/4973/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:13429)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off involving Blue Cross Laboratories Private Limited and Alto Healthcare Private Limited. The court found that Alto Healthcare's use of the mark 'MEFIAL-SPAS' and its packaging was deceptively similar to Blue Cross's registered trademarks 'MEFTAL' and 'MEFTAL-SPAS', and its copyrighted artwork, leading to consumer confusion. The court relied on precedents emphasizing the importance of overall similarity and phonetic resemblance in determining deceptive similarity. The suit was decreed in favor of Blue Cross, granting a permanent injunction against Alto Healthcare and awarding costs of Rs. 5,00,000 to be paid by each defendant within eight weeks, with interest applicable for delays.
Use of ‘Beardsell’ Name Beyond Agreed Entity Prohibited, Rules Madras High Court <i>Beardsell Polymers Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. vs. Beardsell Limited</i> (MANU/TN/1558/2026; OSA(CAD) No.128 of 2022)	The High Court of Madras addressed whether Beardsell Polymers Pvt. Ltd. and others could use the trademark "Beardsell" after a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) allowed only one company, Beardsell Eastern Pvt. Ltd., to use the name. Beardsell Limited, the respondent, claimed exclusive rights to the trademark and allegedly passed off by the appellants. The court found that the MoU permitted only one new company to use the name, and the appellants' additional companies violated this agreement. The court upheld the injunction against the appellants, except Beardsell Eastern Pvt. Ltd., and ordered them to cease using the trademark and pay costs. The appeal was dismissed, affirming the lower court's decision.
Patent Injunction Set Aside by HP HC for Failure to Establish Jurisdictional Nexus <i>Safex Chemicals Private Limited vs. SML Limited and Ors.</i> (MANU/HP/1309/2026; COMAP No. 2 of 2025)	The High Court of Himachal Pradesh addressed the issue of territorial jurisdiction in a patent infringement case between Safex Chemicals Private Limited and SML Limited and others. The court examined whether the alleged sale of the infringing product "Aladdin" within its jurisdiction was sufficient to grant an interim injunction. The court found that the appellant, Safex Chemicals, did not have a manufacturing unit within the court's jurisdiction and that the sales were not authorized by them, thus lacking a prima facie case for jurisdiction. Consequently, the court vacated the interim injunction against Safex Chemicals, allowing the appeal, while noting that the findings were preliminary and subject to further evidence.