

IPR Law Judgments

A Monthly Wrap | **July 2026**



Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Upholds Rejection of Static Mixer Patent, Holding Invention Lacked Novelty and Inventive Step. Sulzer Mixpac AG vs. Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs (MANU/DE/4522/2026: 2026: DHC:5166-DB)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Sulzer Mixpac AG against the rejection of their patent application for a "Static Mixer" by the Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs, which was upheld by a Single Judge. The core issue was whether the invention had an inventive step over prior art, as required by the Patents Act, 1970. The court found that the invention lacked novelty, as prior art documents, particularly D1, already disclosed similar features, including the connection of multiple installation bodies via a common bar element. The court dismissed the appeal, affirming the decision that the invention was not patentable.
Delhi HC Upholds Injunction Protecting Saregama's Copyright in Iconic Sound Recordings Saregama India Limited vs. Black Madras Films and Ors. (MANU/DE/4537/2026: 2026: DHC:5216)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Saregama India Limited and Black Madras Films, among others, regarding the alleged unauthorized use of copyrighted sound recordings and musical works. Saregama sought an injunction to prevent Ilaiyaraaja from using its copyrighted works, claiming ownership through assignment agreements. The court found that Ilaiyaraaja's rights were limited to musical compositions, not sound recordings or lyrics, which belonged to Saregama as the assignee of the original producer's rights. The court upheld the interim injunction against Ilaiyaraaja and Black Madras Films, preventing them from exploiting the disputed works, and dismissed applications to vacate the injunctions. The court referenced prior judgments and statutory provisions to support its decision, emphasizing the distinct rights of producers and composers under the Copyright Act.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Upholds Injunction in ‘AL KAMDHENU GOLD’ Trademark Dispute, Citing Lack of Proprietary Rights. Ashiana Ispat Limited vs. Kamdhenu Limited and Ors. MANU/DE/4576/2026: 2026: DHC:5238:DB)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Ashiana Ispat Limited (AIL) and Kamdhenu Limited (KL) over the use of the trademark "AL KAMDHENU GOLD." The core issue was whether AIL had proprietary rights to the mark based on a 2002 agreement, which KL argued was novated by a 2021 agreement. The court found that AIL failed to secure registration or demonstrate use of the mark, thus lacking proprietary rights. Consequently, the court upheld the injunction against AIL's use of the mark, while restraining KL from using "AL KAMDHENU GOLD" pending final suit resolution. The appeal was dismissed, with directions for preserving both parties' rights until the suits' final determination.
Delhi HC Refuses Interim Injunction in ‘WATERBOX’ Passing-Off Dispute, Citing Lack of Goodwill and Fabricated Evidence. More Than Water Private Limited vs. NESCO Limited (MANU/DE/4577/2026: 2026: DHC:5235-DB)	The High Court of Delhi addressed an appeal by More Than Water Private Limited against NESCO Limited concerning the denial of an absolute interim injunction in a passing-off suit over the trademark 'WATERBOX'. The court upheld the Single Judge's decision, finding that More Than Water failed to establish goodwill and reputation, and had approached the court with unclean hands by relying on fabricated documents. Consequently, the court vacated the territorial injunctions imposed on both parties, allowing them to sell their products beyond their respective states, provided it complies with legal requirements. The court also restrained NESCO from relying on its trademark registration obtained through fabricated evidence.
Delhi HC Grants Injunction Against ‘PANTOPACID’, Upholds Sun Pharma’s ‘PANTOCID’ Trademark Rights Sun Pharma Laboratories Ltd. vs. Finecure Pharmaceuticals Ltd. and Ors. (MANU/DE/4578/2026: 2026: DHC: 5240-DB)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Sun Pharma Laboratories Ltd. against Finecure Pharmaceuticals Ltd. concerning the refusal of an interim injunction by a Single Judge. The core issue was whether Finecure's use of the mark "PANTOPACID" infringed Sun Pharma's registered trademark "PANTOCID." The court found that the marks were structurally, phonetically, and visually similar, constituting infringement. The Single Judge's refusal of the injunction was based on a perceived challenge to the validity of Sun Pharma's trademark registration and alleged non-disclosure of material facts. However, the appellate court disagreed, noting that the prior registration by Takeda had lapsed, and Sun Pharma's registration was valid. The court set aside the Single Judge's findings on suppression and balance of convenience, granting an injunction against Finecure from using the "PANTOPACID" mark. The court allowed Finecure to dispose of existing stock within four months, subject to filing an affidavit of stock details.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Orders Interim Security Deposit in SEP Dispute Between InterDigital and Transsion Interdigital Patent Holdings INC and Ors. vs. Shenzhen Transsion Holdings Co. Ltd. and Ors (MANU/DE/4623/2026: 2026: DHC:5266)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Interdigital Patent Holdings INC and Shenzhen Transsion Holdings Co. Ltd. regarding the alleged unlicensed use of Interdigital's Standard Essential Patents (SEPs) in Transsion's mobile devices. The court considered whether to grant a pro tem security deposit to balance equities while the case is pending. It found that Interdigital had established a prima facie case for the validity and essentiality of its patents, supported by foreign court decisions and technical reports. The court ordered Transsion to deposit a sum equivalent to 1/5th of its last counteroffer or provide a bank guarantee, emphasizing that this interim measure does not determine the final merits of the case.
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 Awards Costs to Bata After Crocs' Design Infringement Suit Fails for Lack of Novelty CROCS INC USA vs. Bata India Ltd. and Ors. (MANU/DE/4743/2026: 2026: DHC: 5476)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Crocs Inc USA and Bata India Ltd. regarding the infringement of Crocs' design registration. The core issue was whether Crocs' design was novel, as Crocs sought an injunction and damages against Bata for alleged imitation. The court found the design lacked novelty and had been previously published, leading to the cancellation of the design by the Deputy Controller of Patents & Designs. Consequently, the suit could not continue. The court awarded costs to Bata, amounting to Rs. 24,63,400, following the principles in Uflex Ltd. v. Government of Tamil Nadu & Ors, emphasising that costs should follow the event in commercial disputes. The application for costs was disposed of, and the execution of petition for recovery of costs was also addressed.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Refuses to Extend Injunction Against 'BOULT' Wordmark in BOAT Trademark Dispute Imagine Marketing Pvt. Ltd. vs. Exotic Mile (MANU/DE/4766/2026: 2026: DHC:5374)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Imagine Marketing Pvt. Ltd. and Exotic Mile regarding the use of the trademark "BOULT," which Imagine Marketing claimed was deceptively similar to its "BOAT" trademark. The court initially granted an interim injunction against Exotic Mile for using device marks similar to "BOAT," but not the wordmark "BOULT." Imagine Marketing later sought to extend this injunction to the wordmark "BOULT," arguing about phonetic similarity. The court dismissed this application, citing no change in circumstances or undue hardship to justify revisiting the earlier decision. The court noted that Exotic Mile had transitioned to using "GOBOULT" and was no longer using "BOULT," thus negating claims of undue hardship.
Delhi HC Remands 'GHOST BUSTER' Trademark Dispute for Fresh Review of 'GHOSTBUSTERS' Well-Known Status Columbia Pictures Industries, INC vs. Registrar of Trademarks and Ors. (MANU/DE/4818/2026: 2026: DHC:5378)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Columbia Pictures Industries, INC, against the Registrar of Trademarks' decision to reject their opposition to the registration of the mark "GHOST BUSTER" by another party. The core issue was whether Columbia's "GHOSTBUSTERS" mark, known for its films and merchandise, should be protected as a well-known trademark under Section 11(2) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, despite the goods being in different classes. The court found that the Registrar failed to consider whether "GHOSTBUSTERS" was entitled to protection as a well-known mark and whether the adoption of "GHOST BUSTER" was in bad faith. The court quashed the Registrar's order and remanded the case for fresh consideration, instructing the Registrar to evaluate the well-known status of the mark and the bad faith claim within three months.
Delhi HC Cancels 'ZORA' Trademark, Holding It Dilutes the Well-Known 'ZARA' Brand Industria De Diseno Textil, S.A. vs. Registrar of Trademarks and Ors. (MANU/DE/4819/2026: 2026: DHC:5373)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Industria De Diseno Textil, S.A. against the Registrar of Trademarks' decision to register the trademark ZORA, arguing it was deceptively similar to their well-known mark ZARA. The court found that ZARA, a globally recognized brand, was entitled to protection under Section 11(2) of the Trademarks Act, 1999, even against dissimilar goods, due to its well-known status. The court held that the marks of ZARA and ZORA were phonetically and visually similar, and the registration of ZORA could dilute ZARA's distinctiveness. Consequently, the court quashed the Registrar's order, canceled ZORA's registration, and directed its removal from the Register of Trademarks.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Permits Amendment of Plaint to Include Trademark Infringement in L'Oréal Dispute Loreal Sa vs. Vekariya Nikunj Arvindbhai and Ors. (MANU/DE/4851/2026:	The High Court of Delhi addressed whether Loreal Sa could amend its plaint to include trademark infringement claims against Vekariya Nikunj Arvindbhai and others, following the registration of its mark "GARNIER BRIGHT COMPLETE" during an ongoing suit for passing off. The court found that the trial court erred in denying the amendment, as the infringement of claim arose from the same facts and trademarks, and allowing the amendment would prevent multiplicity of proceedings. Citing precedents like <i>Rajesh Kumar Aggarwal v. K.K. Modi</i>, the court emphasized that amendments necessary for resolving the real controversy should be permitted. The impugned order was quashed, and the amendment was allowed, directing the trial court to proceed with the amended plaint.
Delhi HC Restrains Use of 'nu:beat' Marks, Citing Similarity with New Balance's 'N' Branding New Balance Athletics Inc. vs. Astormueller AG and Ors. (MANU/DE/4922/2026: 2026: DHC:5573)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a trademark dispute between New Balance Athletics Inc. and Astormueller AG, focusing on whether Astormueller's use of "nu:beat" marks infringed New Balance's "N-marks." The court found that New Balance had established significant goodwill and prior use of its marks, which were deceptively similar to Astormueller's marks, likely causing consumer confusion. The court granted an interim injunction against Astormueller, preventing them from using the contested marks, emphasizing the importance of protecting New Balance's established brand identity. The decision referenced precedents affirming the superiority of common law rights over registered trademarks in cases of passing off.
Delhi HC Grants Interim Injunction Against 'HAVAI', Protects Well-Known 'HAVELLS' Trademark Havells India Limited and Ors. vs. Havai Home Products Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. (MANU/DE/4951/2026: 2026: DHC: 5704)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a trademark dispute between Havells India Limited and Havai Home Products Pvt. Ltd., focusing on whether Havai's use of the mark "HAVAI" infringed upon Havells' well-known trademark "HAVELLS." The court found that Havai's stylized use of "HAVAI" was deceptively similar to "HAVELLS," likely causing confusion among consumers and constituting passing off. The court granted a temporary injunction, restraining Havai from using the impugned trademarks during the suit's pendency, emphasizing that registration does not preclude a passing off action.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi HC Holds OpenAI's AI Training on Publicly Available News Content Prima Facie Protected as Fair Dealing Under Copyright Law. Delhi High Court refuses interim relief to ANI in Copyright suit against OpenAI ANI Media Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Open AI OPCO LLC, (MANU/DE/5106/2026: 2026: DHC: 5900)	The Delhi High Court has observed that OpenAI has made out a prima facie case that the use of ANI's publicly available news content for training its Large Language Models (LLMs) is protected as fair dealing under Section 52(1)(a) of the Copyright Act, as the training process amounts to a form of private research. The Court further found that ANI failed to establish that ChatGPT had memorised or substantially reproduced its copyrighted works, observing that the examples relied upon by ANI were likely generated through Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) rather than model training.
Delhi HC Orders Takedown of Defamatory AI Deepfakes, Affirms Protection for Satirical Content. Raghav Chadha vs. Ashok Kumar John Doe and Ors. (MANU/DE/4517/2026: 2026: DHC:5252)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a case involving Raghav Chadha and Ashok Kumar John Doe, among others, concerning the misuse of Chadha's personality rights through AI-generated deepfake content. The court focused on defamation rather than personality rights, noting that public figures must tolerate criticism unless it is explicitly defamatory. The court found some content to be profane and ordered its removal, while allowing satirical content to remain. Defendants were directed to take down specific URLs and provide subscriber information related to the defamatory content.
Bombay HC Refuses Injunctions in 'Bimbo' Trademark Dispute, Cites Long-Standing Coexistence Bristol Bakery and Ors. vs. Grupo Bimbo S.A.B. DE C.V. and Ors. (MANU/MH/5179/2026: IA.(L) NO. 13958 OF 2023)	The High Court of Bombay addressed a trademark dispute between Bristol Bakery and Grupo Bimbo over the use of the "Bimbo" mark. The core issue was whether Bristol Bakery's use of the mark since 1979 constituted passing off against Grupo Bimbo, which claimed prior international use and reputation. The court found that Bristol Bakery had established prior use in India, while Grupo Bimbo failed to demonstrate trans-border reputation in India before 1979. Both parties were found to have allowed to each other's use of the mark, leading to the dismissal of interim applications for injunctions by both parties. The court emphasized the principle of coexistence due to the long-standing use by both parties.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Bombay HC Holds ‘NOVA MINI’ and ‘NONI’ Labels Infringe ‘NOVA’ Trademark, Orders Compliance Ashok M. Bhat vs. Harichand Nagpal and Ors. (MANU/MH/5303/2026: 5-IAL-9324-2025)	The High Court of Bombay addressed whether Harichand Nagpal and others violated an injunction order by using the 'NOVA MINI' and 'NONI' labels, which allegedly infringed Ashok M. Bhat's registered trademark 'NOVA' and artistic work. The court found that the respondents willfully breached the injunction by using labels deceptively similar to the applicant's registered artistic work. The court ordered the respondents to cease using the infringing labels, disclose sales records, and pay legal and exemplary costs totaling Rs. 82,42,868/-. The court rejected a request to stay in the order, emphasizing the respondents' conduct.
Bombay HC Grants Interim Injunction in ‘HAMON’ Trademark Dispute, Restrains Unauthorized Use John Cockerill Hamon SA vs. Hamon Cooling Systems Private Limited and Ors. (MANU/MH/5216/2026: 6-IA-345-2026)	The High Court of Bombay addressed a trademark of infringement and passing off dispute between John Cockerill Hamon SA and Hamon Cooling Systems Private Limited. The core issue was whether the plaintiff, John Cockerill Hamon SA, was the rightful proprietor of the "HAMON" marks and entitled to restrain the defendants from using similar marks. The court found that the plaintiff had a prima facie case, as the transfer of the HAMON marks to the plaintiff was valid, and the defendants' use was unauthorized post-transfer. The court granted interim relief to the plaintiff, restraining the defendants from using the impugned marks, and noted that the balance of convenience favored the plaintiff. The court referenced precedents supporting the plaintiff's right to enforce the trademark despite pending registration updates
Bombay HC Sets Aside Patent Rejection, Orders Fresh Examination by New Controller Deepak Nitrite Limited vs. The Assistant Controller General of Patents and Designs (MANU/MH/5227/2026: 5-COMMP-107-2025)	The High Court of Bombay addressed the refusal of Deepak Nitrite Limited's patent application by the Assistant Controller General of Patents and Designs, focusing on whether the claimed product and process met the inventive step requirement under the Patents Act, 1970. The court found the refusal based on "common general knowledge" to be inadequately reasoned and lacking substantiation. Consequently, the court set aside the impugned order and remanded the matter for fresh consideration by a different Controller, emphasizing the need for a well-reasoned and speaking order.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Calcutta HC Grants Interim Injunction Against Aditya Birla, Protecting Khadim's 'PRO' Trademark. Khadim India Limited vs. Aditya Birla Lifestyle Brands Limited and Ors. (MANU/WB/1437/2026: IA NO. GA-COM/1/2026 In IP-COM/7/2026)	The High Court of Calcutta addressed a dispute between Khadim India Limited and Aditya Birla Lifestyle Brands Limited regarding the alleged infringement and passing off Khadim's registered trademark "PRO" by Aditya Birla. Khadim claimed long-standing use and market reputation of the "PRO" mark, while Aditya Birla argued the mark's generic nature and questioned its validity. The court found that Khadim had established a prima facie case of infringement and passing off, noting the likelihood of public confusion. Consequently, the court granted an injunction restraining Aditya Birla from using the "PRO" mark on its products.