

IPR Judgment

March 2026



Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>STELLADEXIN Trademark Dispute Reopens, Injunction Restored by Court</p> <p>Products and Ideas India Pvt. Ltd. vs. Nilkamal Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2043/2026; 2026: DHC:2385-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Products and Ideas India Pvt. Ltd. against Nilkamal Limited and others, focusing on the denial of an interim injunction related to trademark infringement of the "STELLADEXIN" mark. The court found that the Single Judge's reliance on Section 34 of the Trademarks Act, which protects prior continuous users, was misplaced due to insufficient evidence of prior use by Stella Industrial Co. Ltd. in India. Additionally, the application of Section 30(3) regarding international exhaustion was incorrect, as it only applies to trademarks registered in India. Consequently, the court set aside the Single Judge's decision, reinstated the interim injunction, and remanded the case for reconsideration. The appeal was allowed without costs, and further proceedings were directed to occur promptly.</p>
<p>'TRACTORJUNCTION' Trademark Cancelled After Fraudulent Claim of Use</p> <p>Rajat Kumar vs. Shivankar Gupta and Ors</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2805/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:7051)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of whether the trademark "TRACTORJUNCTION" registered by Shivankar Gupta was obtained in bad faith and should be canceled. Rajat Kumar, the petitioner, argued that he had prior use of the mark since 2016, while Gupta falsely claimed use since 2018. The court found that Kumar's prior use was substantiated, and Gupta's registration was obtained fraudulently, violating Sections 11(10) and 18 of the Trademarks Act. The court allowed the petition, canceling Gupta's registration, referencing precedents like S. Syed Mohideen v. P. Sulochana Bai.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Defamation Battle Heats Up, News Portal Asked to Take Down Offensive Content</p> <p>TV Today Network Limited vs. News Laundry Media Private Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1990/2026;2026:DHC:2339)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between TV Today Network Limited and News Laundry Media Private Limited concerning alleged defamation, disparagement, and copyright infringement by the latter. The court found a prima facie case of defamation and disparagement against News Laundry, noting that terms like "shit reporters" and "high on weed or opium" were defamatory. However, the court upheld the Single Judge's decision that the balance of convenience favored the defendants, as the issues required trial for resolution.</p>
<p>'PISCO' Cannot Be Exclusively Claimed, Must Be Registered as 'Peruvian Pisco'</p> <p>Embassy of Peru vs. Union of India and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1892/2026;2026:DHC:2259)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between the Embassy of Peru and the Union of India regarding the registration of the Geographical Indication (GI) "PISCO" for an alcoholic beverage. The core issue was whether Peru could register "PISCO" as a standalone GI or if it should include a geographical identifier. The court found that granting the GI "PISCO" solely to Peru would likely cause consumer confusion, as "Pisco" is also associated with a similar beverage from Chile. The court upheld the decision to register the GI as "PERUVIAN PISCO" to avoid confusion, dismissing Peru's appeal for exclusive rights to "PISCO. The court referenced Section 9(a) of the GI Act, which prohibits registration likely to deceive or cause confusion, and allowed the registration with a prefix under Section 11(6) of the GI Act.</p>
<p>Trademark Suit Brought Back to Life After Premature Dismissal Set Aside</p> <p>Coromandel Indag Products India Ltd. vs. Sumitomo Chemical Company Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1894/2026:2026:DHC:2260)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Coromandel Indag Products India Ltd. against Sumitomo Chemical Company Ltd. and others, challenging the rejection of its plaint by a Single Judge under Order VII Rule 11(a) of the CPC for failing to disclose a cause of action. The court found that the plaint sufficiently alleged facts that, if proven, could entitle the plaintiff to relief, including claims of trademark use and goodwill. The court held that the Single Judge erred by considering documents not part of the plaint and engaging in an evaluative exercise beyond the scope of Order VII Rule 11(a). Consequently, the appeal was allowed; the plaint was restored, and the case was remanded for further proceedings.</p>
<p>'Bikaneri Bhujia' Trademark Dispute Ends in Settlement, Brand Use Dropped</p> <p>Unibic Foods India Pvt Ltd vs. Bikaner Bhujia Udyog Sangh</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2064/2026; 2026:DHC:2307-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Unibic Foods India Pvt Ltd and Bikaner Bhujia Udyog Sangh, which was resolved through a settlement mediated by the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre. The core issue involved Unibic's use of the mark "UNIBIC SWAADESI BIKANERI BHUJIA," which they agreed to cease using, and they also agreed to pay INR 6,50,000 to Bikaner Bhujia Udyog Sangh. The court found the settlement terms enforceable, and both parties agreed to abide them, leading to the disposal of the appeal.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>No Trademark Infringement When Both Parties Hold Valid Registrations</p> <p>Rynox Gears vs. Steelite India (MANU/MH/2566/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a trademark infringement and passing off dispute between Rynox Gears and Steelite India. Rynox Gears claimed that Steelite India used a deceptively similar trademark, RHYNOX, for identical goods, infringing on Rynox's trademark RYNOX. The court found that both parties were registered proprietors of their respective trademarks, and under the Trademarks Act, 1999, no infringement claim could be made against a registered proprietor.</p>
<p>LIVOGEM' Restrained Over Strong Similarity with 'LIVOGEN' in Pharma Space</p> <p>Procter and Gamble Health Limited vs. Horizon Bioceuticals Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. (MANU/MH/2605/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off between Procter & Gamble Health Limited and Horizon Bioceuticals Pvt. Ltd. concerning the marks of LIVOGEN and LIVOGEM. The court found that the marks were visually and phonetically similar, posing a risk of confusion, especially given the public health implications of pharmaceutical products. Despite the defendants' claim of coexistence since 2012, the court emphasized the need for a stricter approach in medicinal products, referencing the Cadila Health Care Ltd. precedent.</p>
<p>Cancer Screening Method Denied Patent, Held to Be Diagnostic in Nature</p> <p>Geron Corporation vs. The Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs (MANU/DE/1928/2026;2026:DHC:2206)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Geron Corporation against the Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs, focusing on whether an in vitro screening method for selecting cancer patients for telomerase inhibitor therapy is patentable under Section 3(i) of the Patents Act. The court upheld the Controller's decision, reasoning that the method constitutes a diagnostic process integral to treatment decisions, thus falling under non-patentable subject matter. The appeal was dismissed, affirming that the claimed method is not eligible for patent protection in India, despite being granted in other jurisdictions.</p>
<p>'CHICAGO' Trademark Restored, Cancellation Order Found Flawed</p> <p>Major League Baseball Properties INC vs. Registrar of Trademarks (MANU/DE/2057/2026;2026:DHC:2292)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Major League Baseball Properties Inc. against the Registrar of Trademarks' order canceling the registration of the "CHICAGO" mark. The core issue was whether the Registrar's order could be based on grounds not specified in the show's cause of notice. The court found that the Registrar's decision improperly relied on Section 9(1)(b) of the Trademarks Act, concerning geographical origin, which was not mentioned in the notice. Consequently, the court set aside the impugned order, restored the registration, and allowed the authority to re-issue a notice with specified objections if necessary.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Unauthorized Use of 'MAHINDRA' Stopped, Infringing Domains Ordered Blocked</p> <p>Mahindra and Mahindra Limited and Ors. vs. Diksha Sharma and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1843/2026;2026:DHC:2154)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a trademark infringement dispute between Mahindra and Mahindra Limited and Diksha Sharma, among others, concerning the unauthorized use of the "MAHINDRA" trademark by the defendants, who operated as packers and movers. The court granted a permanent injunction against the defendants, restraining them from using the "MAHINDRA" mark and ordered the blocking of infringing domain names. The court also addressed the issue of extending injunctions to mirror websites post-judgment, ultimately rejecting the plaintiffs' request to empower the Joint Registrar to extend injunctions, citing the court's lack of jurisdiction once a judgment is pronounced.</p>
<p>'GERMINATOR' Mark Protected, Injunction Granted Against Competing Use</p> <p>Bawaskar Technology (Agro) Pvt. Ltd. vs. Anannya Agro Products and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2595/2026; 2026:BHC-AS:12950-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Bawaskar Technology (Agro) Pvt. Ltd. and Anannya Agro Products regarding trademark infringement and passing off concerning the mark "GERMINATOR." The court examined whether the mark was generic or descriptive and if it had acquired distinctiveness. The trial court's decision to deny an injunction was found flawed due to inconsistent findings and lack of evidence supporting the mark's descriptiveness. The High Court set aside the trial court's order, granting an injunction against Anannya Agro Products from using the "GERMINATOR" mark, pending the suit's final resolution.</p>
<p>Court Questions Maintainability of Infringement Claim Against Registered Mark</p> <p>Abros Sports International Pvt. Ltd vs. Ashish Bansal and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/2000/2026;2026:DHC:2352)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of whether Abros Sports International Pvt. Ltd could pursue claims of both trademark infringement and passing off against Ashish Bansal and others. The court had previously referred the infringement issue to a larger bench due to conflicting judgments but noted a Supreme Court decision in S. Syed Mohideen v. P Sulochana Bai, which held that an infringement suit would not lie against a registered trademark. The court stated that the appeal could not be decided in part and required the appellant to move an application if they wished to abandon the infringement claim. The review petition was disposed of accordingly.</p>
<p>'TRANSFORMATION' Allowed, No Confusion Found with Existing Mark</p> <p>Volkswagen AG vs. The Registrar of Trademarks and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1703/2026;2026:DHC:2029)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Volkswagen AG against the Registrar of Trademarks' decision to dismiss Volkswagen's opposition to Maruti Suzuki India Limited's trademark application for 'TRANSFORMATION'. The core issue was whether 'TRANSFORMATION' was deceptively similar to Volkswagen's registered mark '4MOTION'. The court found that the marks were visually, phonetically, and conceptually distinct, emphasizing that 'MOTION' is a common term in the automobile industry and that the prefix 'TRANS' in Maruti's mark sufficiently differentiated it from Volkswagen's.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Copyright FIR Quashed After Settlement Between Parties</p> <p>Sanjay Sethi and Ors. vs. The State GNCT and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1815/2026;2026:DHC:2029)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the petition by Sanjay Sethi and others seeking to quash FIR No. 125/2021, registered for offenses under Section 63 of the Copyright Act, 1957, following a settlement with the complainant, M/s Rajdhani Flour Mills Limited. The court noted that the parties had amicably resolved their dispute, with the complainant expressing no interest in pursuing the case. Despite the ongoing trial, the court exercised its inherent powers to quash the FIR, subject to the petitioners depositing Rs. 10,000 each with the Delhi Legal Services Authority</p>
<p>'KENT' Trademark Battle Turns on Prior Use, Brand Use Restricted</p> <p>Kent Ro Systems Limited and Ors. vs. Kent Cables Private Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1677/2026; 2026:DHC:1986-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Kent Ro Systems Limited and Kent Cables Private Limited regarding the use of the trademark "KENT" for fans. The core issue was whether Kent Cables, who had been using the mark since 1984 for wires and cables, could prevent Kent Ro from using it for fans. The court found that Kent Cables was the prior user of the mark for fans and had established goodwill, while Kent Ro had not used the mark for fans until the suit was filed. The court upheld the Single Judge's decision to restrain Kent Ro from using the mark for fans, citing Kent Cables' prior use and the likelihood of confusion. The appeal was dismissed, with the court emphasizing the limited scope of appellate review in discretionary orders.</p>
<p>Minor Changes in Trademark Don't Affect Valid Use, Removal Denied</p> <p>Sree Lakshmi Balaji Industries vs. Sri Lakshmi Venkateswara Rice Industries and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/TN/0775/2026; 2026:MHC:1056)</p>	<p>The High Court of Madras addressed the issue of whether the trademark of Sri Lakshmi Venkateswara Rice Industries should be removed due to discrepancies in the user date and alleged non-use. Sree Lakshmi Balaji Industries contended that the first respondent's trademark was not used as registered and that the user date was improperly amended. The court found that although records were unavailable to confirm the amendment of the user's date, the use of the mark with minor alterations did not substantially affect its identity, thus qualifying as bona fide use under Section 55 of the Trademarks Act.</p>
<p>Trademark Rejection Overturned Due to Lack of Proper Hearing</p> <p>Nvenia LLC vs. The Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1641/2026;2026:DHC:1934)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Nvenia LLC against the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks, challenging the abandonment of their trademark application for "FISCHBEIN." The core issue was whether the Registrar's decision violated principles of natural justice by not providing adequate notice of objections. The court found that the Registrar failed to raise specific objections in the Examination Report, thus denying Nvenia LLC the opportunity to address them. Consequently, the court set aside the abandonment order and remanded the matter for de novo consideration, instructing the Registrar to issue a fresh hearing notice and allow Nvenia LLC to present relevant documents.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>‘NAUKRIYAN’ Trademark Removed for Being Too Similar to ‘NAUKRI</p> <p>INFO Edge (India) Limited vs. Pradeep Namdeo and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1642/2026;2026:DHC:1933)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Info Edge (India) Limited against the Registrar of Trademarks' decision allowing Pradeep Namdeo's registration of the mark "NAUKRIYAN," which Info Edge claimed was deceptively similar to its well-known trademark "NAUKRI." The court found that "NAUKRIYAN" was indeed deceptively similar to "NAUKRI," as it merely added a plural suffix and could confuse consumers due to the similarity in services offered by both parties. The court quashed the Registrar's order and the registration certificate, instructing the removal of "NAUKRIYAN" from the Trademarks Register, referencing precedents that emphasize the importance of dominant features in trademarks. The appeal was allowed without costs</p>
<p>Logo Found Too Similar to ‘TIGER’, Registration Cancelled</p> <p>Heineken Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. vs. Vijay Keshav Wagh and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1644/2026;2026:DHC:1932)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Heineken Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd. and Vijay Keshav Wagh regarding the copyright registration of an artistic work titled "SHREE SAKSHAT," which Heineken claimed infringed on its TIGER logo. The court found that the respondent's logo was deceptively similar to Heineken's registered TIGER logo, which had international and Indian registrations. The court noted procedural failures by the Trademarks Registry and false declarations by the respondent. Consequently, the court ordered the removal of the respondent's artistic work from the Register of Copyrights, directing compliance within four weeks.</p>
<p>Software Piracy Leads to Injunction and Heavy Cost Imposition</p> <p>Bentley Systems Inc and Ors. vs. Oil tech Engineering India Private Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1646/2026; 2026:DHC:1974)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of copyright infringement involving Bentley Systems Inc. and Oiltech Engineering India Private Limited. Bentley Systems alleged that Oiltech used pirated versions of its STAAD and SACS software without authorization. Despite multiple opportunities, Oiltech failed to file a written statement or reply to the summary judgment application, leading the court to deem the facts as admitted. The court, referencing precedents like Disney Enterprises Inc. vs. Balraj Muttneja, granted a permanent injunction against Oiltech, restraining them from using Bentley's software unlawfully, and awarded costs of Rs. 5,55,087 Bentley.</p>
<p>₹50 Lakh Deposit Ordered in Ongoing Wi-Fi Patent Dispute</p> <p>Atlas Global Technologies LLC vs. TP Link Technologies Co. Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1647/2026;2026:DHC:1970)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Atlas Global Technologies LLC and TP Link Technologies Co. Ltd. regarding the alleged infringement of Standard Essential Patents (SEPs) related to Wi-Fi 6 technology. Atlas sought a security payment from TP Link, claiming misrepresentation of sales figures. The court considered discrepancies between sales data from TP Link and independent research but found no conclusive evidence of misrepresentation. The court ordered TP Link to deposit an additional Rs. 50 lakhs as enhanced pro-tem security, finalizing the security deposit issue, and scheduled further proceedings for July 2026</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Patent Opposition Rejection Set Aside for Lack of Reasoned Order</p> <p>Saurabh Arora vs. Deputy Controller of Patents and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2384/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:6327)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of whether the Deputy Controller of Patents erred in dismissing Saurabh Arora's post-grant opposition to Patent No. IN 283059, granted to another party. The court found that the Deputy Controller failed to provide any reasoning for dismissing the opposition, which was based on prior art with an earlier priority date. The court emphasized the necessity of reasoned orders in judicial determinations and set aside the impugned order, remanding the matter for fresh consideration by a different Controller.</p>
<p>'20-20' Trademark Upheld Despite Competing Prior Use Claim</p> <p>Parle Products Private Limited vs. The Registrar of Trademarks and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1643/2026;2026: DHC:1967)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Parle Products Private Limited against the Registrar of Trademarks' decision to allow the registration of the trademark "20-20" by another applicant, despite Parle's prior use of the mark. The court considered whether the senior adopter of a trademark, who filed first on a 'proposed to be used' basis, should prevail over a junior adopter who began using the mark first. The court upheld the Registrar's decision, emphasizing that the senior adopter's earlier application date under Section 18 of the Trademarks Act, 1999, takes precedence over subsequent use by another party.</p>
<p>Cross-Examination Not Automatic in Trademark Rectification Proceedings</p> <p>Bennett, Coleman and Company Limited vs. E Entertainment Television LLC and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1904/2026;2026: DHC:2010)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the applications by Bennett, Coleman and Company Limited seeking permission to cross-examine a witness from E Entertainment Television LLC in trademark rectification proceedings. The core issue was whether cross-examination was necessary to challenge the validity of E Entertainment's trademark registrations due to alleged non-use and lack of distinctiveness. The court reasoned that cross-examination is not a right but a discretionary measure, to be used sparingly, and found no compelling reasons to allow it in this case. Consequently, both applications for cross-examination were dismissed, and the matter was scheduled for further directions.</p>
<p>Semaglutide Patent Relief Denied Amid Strong Validity Challenge</p> <p>Novo Nordisk A / S vs. Dr Reddys Laboratories Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1632/2026; 2026: DHC:1911-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Novo Nordisk A/S against Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Limited concerning the alleged patent infringement of Semaglutide, an anti-diabetic drug. The core issue was whether the respondents' importation of Semaglutide infringed Novo Nordisk's patent, which was challenged on grounds of invalidity under Sections 64(1)(a), (e), and (f) of the Patents Act, 1970. The court upheld the Single Judge's decision, agreeing that a credible challenge to the patent's validity was established, particularly under Section 64(1)(f) for obviousness, and dismissed the appeal. The court emphasized the principles from <i>Wander Ltd. v. Antox (India) Pvt. Ltd.</i>, limiting appellate interference unless the lower court's discretion was exercised arbitrarily.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Injunction Vacated After Party Found to Have Suppressed Key Facts</p> <p>Elder Neutraceuticals Private Limited vs. Elder Pproject Limited</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2292/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:6101)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a trademark of infringement and passing off dispute between Elder Neutraceuticals Private Limited and Elder Projects Limited. The core issue was whether Elder Projects suppressed material facts to obtain an ex-parte injunction against Elder Neutraceuticals. The court found that Elder Projects failed to disclose its past association with Elder Pharmaceuticals Ltd., adverse orders from the Delhi High Court, and proceedings by the Official Liquidator, which were crucial for deciding the injunction. Consequently, the court vacated the ex-parte injunction, dismissed Elder Projects' application for a temporary injunction, and awarded costs to Elder Neutraceuticals.</p>
<p>Sale of Refurbished Hard Drives Allowed, No Trademark Infringement Found</p> <p>Western Digital Technologies Inc. and Ors. vs. Geonix International Private Limited and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1631/2026;2026: DHC:1908-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of whether Western Digital Technologies Inc. and Seagate Technology LLC's trademarks were infringed by Geonix International Pvt Ltd and others, who imported and refurbished end-of-life hard disk drives (HDDs) originally sold by the appellants. The court found no infringement or passing off, as the respondents removed the appellants' trademarks before resale, and the goods were lawfully acquired. The court upheld the single judge's directions allowing the sale of refurbished HDDs with specific disclosures, dismissing the appeals. The decision referenced the principle of international exhaustion and the case of Kapil Wadhwa v. Samsung Electronics Co.</p>
<p>Crocodile Logo Dispute Ends with Injunction Against Infringing Use</p> <p>Crocodile International Pte. Ltd. vs. La Chemise Lacoste and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/1652/2026:2026: DHC:1918-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Crocodile International Pte. Ltd. and La Chemise Lacoste regarding the use of a crocodile emblem. The core issue was whether Crocodile International's use of the emblem infringed Lacoste's trademark and copyright in India. The court found that the 1983 and 1985 agreements did not extend to India, and Crocodile International's use of the mark constituted trademark and copyright infringement. However, Lacoste's claim for passing off was not upheld due to insufficient evidence of goodwill in India. The court granted a permanent injunction against Crocodile International for trademark and copyright infringement but set aside the award of costs against them.</p>
<p>Copyright Suit Dismissed with ₹10 Lakh Cost for Concealment of Facts</p> <p>Rajiv Suri vs. Hinduja Global Solutions Ltd.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2189/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:5877)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of whether Rajiv Suri could claim damages and an injunction against Hinduja Global Solutions Ltd. for allegedly unauthorized telecasts of the films "Manzil" and "Parwana." The court found that Suri had suppressed material documents, including a Memorandum of Understanding and a Deed of Assignment, which showed that disputes over "Manzil" were settled and rights to "Parwana" were assigned to Zee Telefilms Ltd. Consequently, the court dismissed the suit, ordered Suri to pay costs of Rs. 10,00,000 to the defendant, and emphasized the importance of honesty in legal proceedings, citing precedents on the abuse of judicial process.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>‘C21’ Trademark Cancelled After Finding of Dishonest Adoption</p> <p>Century 21 Real Estates LLC vs. Century 21 Town Planners Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/MH/2296/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:6096)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Century 21 Real Estates LLC and Century 21 Town Planners Pvt. Ltd. regarding the latter's registration of the "C21" trademark. The core issue was whether the respondent's use of "C21" was dishonest, given the petitioner's established global and Indian rights to "CENTURY 21" and "C21." The court found that the respondent's adoption of the mark was in bad faith, as it mirrored the petitioner's well-known trademark and business model. The court ordered the removal of the respondent's trademark registrations from the register, recognizing the petitioner's prior rights and goodwill.</p>
<p>‘777 Oil’ Trademark Protected, Infringing Products Ordered to Be Destroyed</p> <p>J. R. K ' S. Research and Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd vs. Sanjeevi Pharma</p> <p>(MANU/TN/0710/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Madras addressed a trademark dispute between J.R. K'S Research and Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd and Sanjeevi Pharma, focusing on the use of the "777 Oil" trademark. The court found that J.R.K'S had lawful rights over the "777 Oil" trademark, which was registered and unchallenged, while Sanjeevi Pharma's "SANJEEVI 777 OIL" trademark had been rectified and removed from the register by the IPAB, a decision that was upheld and not appealed. The court ruled that Sanjeevi Pharma could not lawfully use the "SANJEEVI 777 OIL" trademark and granted a permanent injunction against them, ordering the surrender and destruction of infringing products. The appeal was allowed, and the previous judgment was set aside.</p>