

IPR Judgment

April 2026



Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Allows Grand Chemical to Sell Existing Stock with Modified Packaging in Reckitt Trade Dress Dispute</p> <p>Akash Arora Trading as Grand Chemical Works vs. Reckitt and Colman Overseas Hygiene Home Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2881/2026; 2026: DHC:3282-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a trademark dispute between Sunflame Enterprises P. Ltd. and Kitchenopedia Appliances P. Ltd. regarding the use of the mark "SUNFLARE," which Sunflame claimed was deceptively similar to its "SUNFLAME" mark. The court found that the marks were visually and phonetically similar, leading to a likelihood of consumer confusion. It granted an interim injunction restraining Kitchenopedia from using the "SUNFLARE" mark, citing Sunflame's established goodwill and prior use. The court referenced precedents on trademark similarity and confusion, and the case was scheduled for further proceedings. The appeal remains pending for further hearing.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Refuses Interim Relief in Ceiling Fan Design Infringement Case Against Stove Kraft</p> <p>Atomberg Technologies Private Limited vs. Stove Kraft Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3685/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:9652)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between Atomberg Technologies Private Limited and Stove Kraft Limited regarding alleged design infringement and passing off ceiling fans. Atomberg claimed that Stove Kraft's fan imitated its registered design, seeking an injunction and damage. The court found that Atomberg failed to demonstrate the novelty or distinctiveness of its design compared to Stove Kraft's fan, noting visible differences in key features. The court dismissed Atomberg's interim application for relief, discharged the Court Receiver, and ordered the release of Stove Kraft's seized goods, referencing established legal principles for design infringement and passing off.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Denies Injunction to More Than Water for Failure to Prove Goodwill in 'My Water Box' Dispute</p> <p>More Than Water Private Limited vs. NESCO Limited</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2716/2026;2026: DHC:3097)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between More Than Water Private Limited and NESCO Limited regarding the alleged passing off and copyright infringement of trademarks related to packaged drinking water. The core issue was whether More Than Water, claiming prior use since 2018, could establish substantial goodwill and reputation to warrant an interim injunction against NESCO's use of the mark "My Water Box." The court found that More Than Water failed to provide sufficient evidence of substantial sales or promotional expenses to establish goodwill. Consequently, the court denied the interim injunction but restricted both parties to sell their products under their respective trademarks within their respective states, Gujarat and Maharashtra, during the suit's pendency.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Sets Aside Patent Rejection of Navya Network, Cites Lack of Reasoning and Natural Justice Violation</p> <p>Navya Network Inc. vs. Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3670/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:9481)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the challenge by Navya Network Inc. against the Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs' refusal of their patent application for a "Medical Research Retrieval Engine." The core issue was whether the application lacked an inventive step and was non-patentable as a computer program per se. The court found that the Assistant Controller failed to provide adequate reasoning or follow established legal tests for inventive step analysis, and introduced new grounds not previously communicated to Navya, violating principles of natural justice. Consequently, the court set aside the refusal and remanded the matter for reconsideration, ensuring Navya is given a hearing and a reasoned decision.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Cancels 'SOCIAL' Trademark Held by Choksi, Finds Trademark Squatting and Non-Use</p> <p>Impressario Entertainment and Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. vs. Vardhaman Choksi and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2612/2026; 2026: DHC:2995)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Impressario Entertainment and Hospitality Pvt. Ltd. and Vardhaman Choksi regarding the use and registration of the trademark 'SOCIAL'. Impressario sought to cancel Choksi's trademark registration, arguing non-use and trademark squatting, while Choksi claimed prior to use and generic nature of the term. The court found that Choksi had not used the mark for the registered services and identified a pattern of trademark squatting. Consequently, the court allowed Impressario's appeal, directing the removal of Choksi's trademark from the register, and dismissed Choksi's rectification petitions.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Holds 'AL KAMDHENU GOLD' Use Unauthorized, Grants Injunction to Kamdhenu Limited</p> <p>Ashiana Ispat Limited vs . Kamdhenu Limited</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2617/2026; 2026: DHC:3002)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Ashiana Ispat Limited (AIL) and Kamdhenu Limited (KL) concerning the use of the trademark 'AL KAMDHENU GOLD'. The core issue was whether AIL had the right to use the disputed mark, which KL claimed infringed its registered trademarks. The court found that the 2002 Agreement between the parties constituted a license rather than an assignment of the trademark to AIL, and that the 2021 Agreement novated the 2002 Agreement. Consequently, AIL's use of the mark was deemed unauthorized, and KL's claim of infringement was upheld. The court granted an interim injunction in favor of KL, restraining AIL from using the disputed mark, and dismissed AIL's application for interim relief.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Grants Injunction Against Nippon Paint for Using 'INFINITY', Finds Deceptive Similarity</p> <p>Nippon Paint (India) Private Limited vs. Glossy Paints India Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2749/2026;2026:DHC:3003)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Nippon Paint (India) Private Limited and Glossy Paints India Pvt. Ltd. regarding the use of the trademark "INFINITY." The core issue was whether Nippon Paint's use of the "Impugned Mark" infringed on Glossy Paints' registered "Subject Mark." The court found that Nippon Paint's mark was deceptively similar to Glossy Paints' mark, leading to potential consumer confusion. Consequently, the court granted an interim injunction against Nippon Paint, restraining them from using the mark, and dismissed Nippon Paint's rectification petition challenging the validity of Glossy Paints' trademark registration.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Upholds Injunction Against Flipkart's 'MARQ' Mark in 'MARC' Trademark Dispute</p> <p>Flipkart India Private Limited vs. Marc Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2753/2026; 2026:DHC:3004)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Flipkart India Private Limited and Marc Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. concerning the alleged infringement of the trademark 'MARC' by Flipkart's use of 'MARQ'. The court examined whether the marks were deceptively similar, potentially causing consumer confusion. It upheld the trial court's decision granting an injunction against Flipkart, finding the marks phonetically and visually similar, and noting that Flipkart's later trademark registrations did not alter this conclusion. The appeal was dismissed, and Flipkart was given until May 15, 2026, to comply with the injunction.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Refuses Injunction in 'Shot Squad League' Case, Finds No Substantial Copyright Copying</p> <p>Gurbaaz Pratap Singh Mann vs. Kunwar Raghav Bhandari and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2618/2026; 2026:DHC:3001)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Gurbaaz Pratap Singh Mann and Kunwar Raghav Bhandari and others regarding alleged copyright infringement of Mann's game format "SHOT SQUAD LEAGUE." Mann sought an interim injunction to prevent the defendants from using a similar format in their "IGPL FLASH GOLF/SMASH FORMAT." The court found no substantial copying of Mann's copyrighted work, as the defendants' format differed in key aspects. The court dismissed the application for an interim injunction, noting the defendants' voluntary cessation of using the word "SMASH" in their format.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Upholds Jurisdiction in Patent Suit Against Blick System Based on Partial Cause of Action</p> <p>Innovation Glass India Pvt Ltd and Ors. vs . Blick System India Pvt Ltd</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2835/2026; 2026:DHC:2992)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Innovation Glass India Pvt Ltd and Blick System India Pvt Ltd regarding patent infringement and jurisdiction. The core issue was whether the court had territorial jurisdiction to hear the patent infringement suit, given that the defendant argued the lack of jurisdiction based on the location of alleged infringement activities. The court reasoned that the issuance of a tender by the Airports Authority of India in Delhi and the defendant's revocation petition filed in the same court established partial cause of action within its jurisdiction.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Sets Aside Injunction Against Info Edge in AmbitionBox Defamation Dispute, Leaves Intermediary Issue Open</p> <p>Info Edge India Ltd. vs. Synapseindia Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2836/2026; 2026: DHC:3006-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Info Edge India Ltd. and Synapseindia Outsourcing Pvt. Ltd. regarding alleged trademark infringement and defamation due to negative reviews on Info Edge's platform, AmbitionBox. The court considered Info Edge's claim of being a neutral platform and its undertaking to manage content responsibly, while Synapseindia contested Info Edge's intermediary status. The court set aside the interim injunction, allowing Info Edge to host a new page for Synapseindia, and decreed the suit based on Info Edge's undertakings, leaving the intermediary status issue open for future disputes. The appeal was disposed of with directions for compliance and further actions.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Orders Cancellation of 'GOLDI' Trademark, Upholds Prior Rights of Goldiee Masale</p> <p>Shubham Goldiee Masale Pvt. Ltd vs. Jai Shiv Oil Industries and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2582/2026; 2026: DHC:2935)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Shubham Goldiee Masale Pvt. Ltd and Jai Shiv Oil Industries regarding the trademark "GOLDI," which Shubham Goldiee claimed was deceptively similar to its own "GOLDIEE" mark. The court found that Shubham Goldiee was the prior user and registrant of the mark, and that the respondent's mark was phonetically, visually, and structurally similar, likely causing consumer confusion. The court ordered the cancellation of the "GOLDI" trademark from the Register of Trademarks, directing the Registrar to comply within six weeks, referencing precedents like Fybos Electric (P) Ltd. and FDC Limited</p>
<p>Delhi HC Dismisses Crystal Crop's Patent Appeal, Finds Lack of Novelty and Inventive Step</p> <p>Crystal Crop Protection Limited vs . Sudpita Dey Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2630/2026; 2026: DHC:2926)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Crystal Crop Protection Limited against the refusal of their patent application for an insecticidal composition by the Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs. The core issue was whether the composition, claimed to be novel and inventive due to its synergistic effect, met the requirements of novelty and inventive step under the Patents Act, 1970. The court found that prior arts CN'627 and CN'546 disclosed similar compositions, thus lacking novelty, and that the claimed invention was obvious to a person skilled in the art, lacking an inventive step. Consequently, the court dismissed the appeal, upholding the Assistant Controller's decision.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Finds 'ESIRAFT' Deceptively Similar to 'RACIRAFT', Applies Cadila Test in Pharma Trademark Dispute</p> <p>Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. vs. Meghmani Lifesciences Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3573/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:9214-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off between Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and Meghmani Lifesciences Ltd. Sun Pharmaceutical claimed that Meghmani's use of the mark 'ESIRAFT' was deceptively similar to its registered trademark 'RACIRAFT', both used for similar pharmaceutical products. The court found that the marks were phonetically similar, which could lead to confusion among consumers, especially given the context of pharmaceutical products where confusion could have serious consequences. The court applied the test of deceptive similarity as laid down in Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd., emphasizing the importance of phonetic similarity and the potential for confusion.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Upholds Ad-Interim Injunction in 'NAFIS vs NAFEEZA' Case, Remands for Fresh Hearing</p> <p>Ritik Kumar vs. R. H. Agro Overseas</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2555/2026; 2026: DHC:2843-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Ritik Kumar against an ex-parte ad-interim injunction granted by the Trial Court in favor of R.H. Agro Overseas, concerning alleged trademark infringement of the mark 'NAFIS' by 'NAFEEZA'. The court found that the Trial Court erred procedurally by disposing of the injunction application without hearing the appellant, violating principles of natural justice. The High Court sustained the ad-interim injunction but remanded the application for fresh adjudication, allowing Ritik Kumar to file a reply.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Sets Aside Patent Rejection in Atomic Energy Case, Directs Fresh Consideration</p> <p>Huntington Alloys Corporation vs. Union of India and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3632/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:9464-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of Huntington Alloys Corporation's patent application rejection by the Union of India and others, focusing on whether the invention related to atomic energy, thus barring patentability under the Atomic Energy Act, 1962, and the Patents Act, 1970. The court found that the rejection of orders lacked reasoning, denying the petitioner the opportunity to amend the application. Citing the need for reasoned decisions, the court set aside the orders and directed reconsideration of the application with a reasoned order, allowing Huntington to submit additional materials. The writ petition was absolutely made.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Dismisses Laser Shaving's Appeal, Denies 'SETMAX' Trademark Protection Due to Suppression of Facts</p> <p>Laser Shaving India Pvt Ltd vs. RKM International Products Pvt Ltd and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3572/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:9090-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the appeal by Laser Shaving India Pvt Ltd against the dismissal of its interim application for an injunction against RKM International Products Pvt Ltd and others. The core issue was whether Laser Shaving could claim exclusive rights to the "SETMAX" trademark and packaging, alleging passing off and copyright infringement. The court found that Laser Shaving had suppressed material facts and made contradictory statements regarding the similarity of its trademark to Galactic's, which estopped it from claiming infringement. The court upheld the lower court's decision, dismissing the appeal and refusing the injunction, emphasizing the importance of approaching the court with clean hands and the applicability of prosecution history estoppel.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Condones Delay in Jain Irrigation Appeal, Imposes Costs and Tags with Connected Matter</p> <p>Jain Irrigation Systems Limited vs. Dura - Line India Private Limited</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2724/2026;2026: DHC:2912-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of whether Jain Irrigation Systems Limited's delay in filing and refiling an appeal against a judgment dismissing its counterclaim for patent revocation should be condoned. The parties involved are Jain Irrigation Systems Limited and Dura-Line India Private Limited. The court found that the delay was due to a mistaken belief about the necessity of separate appeals and technical difficulties in e-filing, which did not prejudice the respondent. The court condoned the 54-day delay in filing and the 111-day delay in refiling the appeal, imposing costs on the appellant, and scheduled the appeal to be heard alongside a related case.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Disposes Ultracon Appeal, Allows Affidavit Filing in Domain Name and Trade Name Dispute</p> <p>Ultracon Structural System Private Limited vs . Ultracon Corporation Pte Ltd and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2640/2026; 2026: DHC:2774-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Ultracon Structural System Private Limited and Ultracon Corporation Pte Ltd regarding the use of the domain name "www.ultraconindia.com" and the corporate name "Ultracon Structural Systems Private Limited," which the Single Judge ordered to cease due to a violation of an injunction. The appellants argued about their right to use the trade name and logo, citing pending arbitration and procedural applications. The court allowed the appellants to file an affidavit without prejudice and noted that pending applications should be completed by 04.04.2026. The appeals were disposed of, with the court taking note of the respondents' agreement not to enforce the order until related applications are resolved.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Bars Sale of 'OLD FORESTER' Whiskey Imported from Nepal, Holds It as Counterfeit Goods</p> <p>Brown - Forman Distillery, Inc. vs. Brewholik Private Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2371/2026; 2026: DHC:2760)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Brown-Forman Distillery, Inc. and Brewholik Private Limited regarding the alleged infringement of the "OLD FORESTER" trademark. Brown-Forman claimed trademark rights in India, while Brewholik sought to sell whiskey imported from Nepal under the same mark. The court emphasized that under Section 29 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, and Section 2(16) of the Delhi Excise Act, 2009, importing goods infringing a registered trademark constitutes infringement, and such goods are deemed "counterfeit." The court dismissed Brewholik's application to sell the seized goods, citing legal prohibitions against selling infringing products.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Refuses Clarification in 'SUJATA' Trademark Case, Upholds Earlier Injunction</p> <p>Mittal Electronics vs. Sujata Home Appliances (P) Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2372/2026; 2026: DHC:2755)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Mittal Electronics and Sujata Home Appliances (P) Ltd. regarding the use of the trademark 'SUJATA'. The core issue was whether the defendant could use 'SUJATA' as a trade or corporate name for specific products, despite an earlier injunction. The court examined previous orders and found that the defendant was restrained from using 'SUJATA' as a corporate name, except for certain products. The court dismissed the defendant's application for clarification, noting the delay in seeking it and the clear intention of previous orders. The application was dismissed, and the court upheld the original injunction.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Allows Limited Sale of 'WHITE OUD' Perfumes Pending Trial, Encourages Mediation</p> <p>Helios Lifestyle Limited vs. Idam Natural Wellness Private Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2494/2026; 2026: DHC:2782-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed an appeal by Helios Lifestyle Limited against an order restraining them from using trademarks similar to Idam Natural Wellness Private Ltd.'s "WHITE OUD" and "BELLAVITA WHITE OUD." The court acknowledged the appellant's argument that foundational facts were not adequately pleaded and allowed Helios to continue selling certain perfumes while maintaining sales records until the applications under Order XXXIX of the CPC are decided. The court encouraged the parties to explore settlement through mediation and scheduled further proceedings for April 30, 2026. The appeal and pending applications were disposed of, leaving all contentions open for the Single Judge's decision.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Delhi HC Cancels 'S.S. WHITE' Trademark Registration, Finds Bad Faith Adoption</p> <p>S. S. White Burs Inc. vs. The Registrar of Trademarks and Ors</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2994/2026;2026:DHC:3478)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between S.S. White Burs Inc. and S.S. White Dental Private Limited over the trademark 'S.S. WHITE'. The court found that S.S. White Burs Inc. had prior rights to the mark, dating back to 1844, and that S.S. White Dental's adoption of the mark was unauthorized and in bad faith. The court ordered the cancellation of S.S. White Dental's trademark registration and dismissed their counterpetition. The court also imposed costs on S.S. White Dental and directed the Registrar to investigate procedural lapses in the trademark registration process.</p>
<p>Gauhati HC Upholds Criminal Proceedings in Design Theft Case, Affirms Territorial Jurisdiction</p> <p>Sanjeev Gaur and Ors. vs. The State of Assam and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/GH/0312/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Gauhati addressed the issue of whether the criminal proceedings against Sanjeev Gaur and others should be quashed, focusing on allegations of design theft and manufacturing of identical machines. The petitioners argued about lack of territorial jurisdiction and insufficient evidence, while the State contended that part of the offense occurred within the jurisdiction of the Boko court. The court found that the Boko court had jurisdiction under Section 178 CrPC, as part of the alleged offense occurred there, and upheld the trial court's decision to take cognizance and issue summons. The criminal petition was dismissed, and the stay on proceedings was vacated.</p>
<p>Delhi HC Quashes Refusal of 'KAMA CASA' Trademark, Applies Anti-Dissection Rule</p> <p>Modi Woodspace Private Limited vs. The Registrar of Trademarks</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2962/2026;2026:DHC:3341)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Modi Woodspace Private Limited against the Registrar of Trademarks' refusal to register the trademark "KAMA CASA" under Section 11(1) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, due to its similarity with existing marks "KAMA" and "CASA." The court found that the Registrar improperly dissected the composite wordmark into its components, contrary to the Anti Dissection Rule, which requires marks to be considered. The court quashed the impugned order and remitted the matter for de novo consideration, instructing the Registrar to also consider a search report submitted by the appellant. The appeal was allowed, with no costs ordered.</p>
<p>Bombay HC Grants Injunction to Sun Pharma Against 'ABSUN' Marks, Awards ₹10 Lakh Costs</p> <p>Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. vs. Satej M. Katekar</p> <p>(MANU/MH/3882/2026; 2026:BHC-OS:10273)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. and Satej M. Katekar regarding the alleged infringement and passing off of Sun's registered trademarks 'SUN'/'SUN PHARMA' by Katekar's use of 'ABSUN'/'ABSUN PHARMA'. The court found that the defendant's marks were deceptively similar to the plaintiff's, constituting infringement under Section 29 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, and that the defendant's actions amounted to passing off. The court decreed in favor of Sun Pharmaceutical, granting an injunction and awarding costs of Rs. 10 lakhs, while dismissing the defendant's defenses of honest adoption and acquiescence.</p>