

IPR Judgment

January 2026



Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>“SUNFLARE” too close to “SUNFLAME”: Delhi High Court steps in</p> <p>Sunflame Enterprises P. Ltd. vs. Kitchenopedia Appliances P. Ltd. and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/0677/2026; 2026: DHC:783)</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.</p>
<p>LAMBRETTA row: Delhi High Court pulls up Trademark Registry for flip-flop</p> <p>Innocenti SA vs. Examiner of Trademarks and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/0672/20 26;2026: DHC:784)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Innocenti SA and August Ventures Private Limited regarding the registration of the "LAMBRETTA" trademark. Innocenti challenged the Registrar of Trademarks' refusal to register their trademark, while August Ventures sought to quash the acceptance of Innocenti's applications, arguing they were accepted in error. The court found that the Registrar had taken inconsistent positions on similar applications and set aside the refusal order, directing the Registrar to reconsider all related applications and oppositions, including rectification petitions, after hearing both parties. The court dismissed the writ petitions filed by August Ventures, emphasizing the availability of statutory remedies under the Trademarks Act.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Trademark suit: No second chances for late documents, says Delhi High Court</p> <p>Shyam Rastogi Trading and Ors. vs. Hugo Boss Trademark Management Gmbh and Co Kg and Ors.</p> <p>(MANU/DE/0600/20 26; 2026: DHC:703)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of whether Shyam Rastogi Trading and others could introduce additional documents in a trademark dispute against Hugo Boss Trademark Management GmbH. The court examined whether there was a "reasonable cause" for not submitting these documents with the initial written statement, as required under Order XI Rule 1(10) of the CPC for commercial suits. The court found that the petitioners failed to provide a satisfactory explanation for the delay in filing the documents, which were largely in their possession. Consequently, the court dismissed the petition, upholding the trial court's decision to reject the application for introducing additional documents.</p>
<p>Trade dress battle: Delhi High Court restrains Dabur's "Cool King Thanda Tael"</p> <p>Emami Limited vs. Dabur India Limited (MANU/DE/0676/20 26;2026: DHC: 795)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Emami Limited and Dabur India Limited regarding the alleged passing off of Dabur's product, "Cool King Thanda Tael," as Emami's "Navratna Oil" through a deceptively similar trade dress. Emami claimed that Dabur's product imitated its distinctive red packaging and other features, leading to consumer confusion. The court found that Dabur's trade dress was deceptively similar to Emami's, emphasizing the overall impression rather than individual elements. Consequently, the court granted an injunction restraining Dabur from using the impugned trade dress, supporting Emami's claim of passing off.</p>
<p>Copyright suit maintainable even without probate, rules Calcutta High Court</p> <p>Dev Sahitya Kutir Pvt Ltd vs. Archana Debnath and Ors. (MANU/WB/0138/20 26; 2026: CHC-AS:96-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Calcutta addressed the issue of copyright infringement involving Dev Sahitya Kutir Pvt Ltd and Archana Debnath and others, focusing on whether the plaintiffs had the locus standi to file the suit without probate of the Will. The court reasoned that the plaintiffs, as executor and legatee, could maintain the suit to protect the estate, even before probate, under Sections 211 and 227 of the Indian Succession Act. The court dismissed the appeal, affirming the interim injunction against the appellant, and emphasized that copyright infringement cases warrant injunctions irrespective of potential monetary compensation. The court referenced precedents like Midas Hygiene Industries and Renaissance Hotel Holdings to support its decision.</p>
<p>Piracy crackdown: Delhi High Court bans illegal streaming of ICC Women's T20 World Cup</p> <p>Star India Private Limited vs. Crichd. PK and Ors. (MANU/DE/0643/2026; 2026: DHC: 733)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of unauthorized streaming of the 'ICC Women's T20 World Cup 2024' by rogue websites, with Star India Private Limited seeking a permanent injunction against Crichd.PK and others. The court found that Star India, having exclusive media rights, was entitled to protection against infringement by the defendants, who did not contest the suit. Consequently, the court granted a permanent injunction restraining the defendants from unauthorized dissemination of the event, and the suit was disposed of with directions to draw up the decree sheet.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Bombay High Court backs prior user, slaps Rs. 10 lakh costs in SKG trademark fight</p> <p>SKG Consultants and Engg Pvt. Ltd. vs. SKG Project and Engg Pvt. Ltd (MANU/MH/0529/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:2040)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between SKG Consultants and Engg Pvt. Ltd. and SKG Project and Engg Pvt. Ltd. over the use of the trademark "SKG" in civil engineering services. The court found that SKG Consultants, the plaintiff, had established prior use and goodwill of the trademark, and that the defendant's use of the same mark was dishonest and likely to cause confusion. The court decreed in favor of SKG Consultants, granting an injunction against the defendant's use of the trademark and declaring the plaintiff as the registered owner. The defendant was ordered to pay costs of Rs. 10,00,000 to the plaintiff.</p>
<p>Bombay High Court restrains misuse of "TRACKON" courier brand</p> <p>Trackon Couriers Private Limited vs. B.N. Srinivas (MANU/MH/0531/2026; 2026: BHC-OS:2082)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Trackon Couriers Private Limited and B.N. Srinivas regarding the alleged infringement and passing off of the "TRACKON" trademark. The court found that Trackon Couriers, as the registered proprietor of the "TRACKON" marks, was entitled to protection against the unauthorized use of similar marks by B.N. Srinivas. The court rejected the defendant's claims of prior use and jurisdictional objections, noting that the defendant had not filed a written statement and had agreed to cease using the mark. The court granted interim relief to Trackon Couriers, restraining B.N. Srinivas from using the impugned mark, and awarded costs to the plaintiff.</p>
<p>Trademark cancelled without notice? Madras High Court says not so fast</p> <p>Perundurai Chennimalai Gounder Duraisamy Trading as Sakthi Trading Company vs. The Registrar of Trademarks and Ors. (MANU/TN/0186/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Madras addressed the issue of whether the Registrar of Trade Marks was justified in unilaterally canceling the trademark registration of Perundurai Chennimalai Gounder Duraisamy, trading as Sakthi Trading Company, without notice, and subsequently treating the application as abandoned. The court found that the cancellation of the trademark certificate, which had been issued and renewed over the years, was done without due process and violated principles of natural justice. The court noted that any grievances should have been addressed through rectification proceedings, not unilateral cancellation. Consequently, the court set aside the impugned order and directed the reinstatement of the appellant's trademark registration within four weeks. The appeal was allowed, with no costs awarded.</p>
<p>"Nandini" for agarbattis blocked: Madras High Court allows opposition</p> <p>Karnataka Cooperative Milk Producers Federation Limited vs. Vinod Kanji Shah and Nitin Kanji Shah, Trading as Shalimar Agarbatti Company and Ors (MANU/TN/0131/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Madras addressed the dispute between Karnataka Cooperative Milk Producers Federation Limited and Vinod Kanji Shah & Nitin Kanji Shah regarding the registration of the trademark 'Nandini' for agarbattis and doops. The court found that the second respondent erred in dismissing the appellant's opposition, as the first respondent's use of 'Nandini' was phonetically and stylistically similar to the appellant's well-known dairy trademark, potentially misleading consumers. Citing the Supreme Court's decision in Nandhini Deluxe, the court distinguished the present case due to the lack of any prefix or suffix in the first respondent's mark and allowed the appeal, setting aside the previous order.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>No goodwill, no injunction: Delhi High Court dismisses Rexcin's plea</p> <p>Rexcin Pharmaceuticals P Ltd vs. Rekin Pharma P Ltd and Ors. (MANU/DE/0518/2026; 2026: DHC:643)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Rexcin Pharmaceuticals P Ltd and Rekin Pharma P Ltd regarding trademark infringement and passing off. Rexcin sought to cancel Rekin's trademark "REKIN-SP," claiming it was deceptively similar to its own "REXCIN" mark. The court found that Rexcin had not used "REXCIN" as a trademark for its products, while Rekin was a bona fide user of "REKIN-SP" since 2017. The court dismissed Rexcin's petition, finding no evidence of confusion or goodwill in Rexcin's mark, and denied an interim injunction against Rekin. The case was listed for further directions.</p>
<p>Patent rejection set aside: Delhi High Court flags procedural lapses</p> <p>Jesal Vimal Jetha vs. Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks (MANU/DE/0499/2026; 2026: DHC:573)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Jesal Vimal Jetha against the Controller General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, challenging the refusal of a patent application for a comforter system. The core issue was whether the patent application lacked an inventive step under Section 2(1)(ja) of the Patents Act, 1970. The court found procedural irregularities, including a failure to consider detailed responses and a lack of adherence to principles of natural justice. Consequently, the court set aside the impugned order and remanded the matter for fresh consideration, ensuring a fair hearing and compliance with procedural requirements.</p>
<p>Patent infringement proved: Delhi High Court awards damages to Merck</p> <p>Merck Sharp and Dohme Corp. and Ors. vs. Ranvir Kumar Bindeshwari Singh and Ors (MANU/DE/0469/2026; 2026: DHC:571)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a dispute between Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. and Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. against Ranvir Kumar Bindeshwari Singh and others regarding the infringement of a patent covering the molecule Sitagliptin. The court found that the defendants had infringed the patent by exporting the infringing product SEPAMET-XR, despite being aware of the plaintiffs' rights. The court awarded the plaintiffs compensatory damages of Rs. 49,44,450, exemplary damages of Rs. 10,00,000, and legal costs of Rs. 21,67,074, to be paid by the defendants jointly and severally. The suit was decreed in favor of the plaintiffs, with reference to precedents like Koninlijke Philips & Ors. vs. Amazestore and Ors. for calculating damages.</p>
<p>Rectification pending: Punjab and Haryana High Court stays infringement claim</p> <p>Sanjeev Kumar Juneja and Ors. vs. Terrace Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd. (MANU/PH/0167/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Punjab and Haryana addressed a dispute between Sanjeev Kumar Juneja and others, and Terrace Pharmaceuticals Pvt. Ltd., concerning the validity and alleged infringement of the "MANTRA" trademark. The court examined whether the trial court could assess the trademark's validity when rectification proceedings were pending and whether Section 124 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, mandated staying the suit for infringement but not for passing off. The court concluded that the trial court should have allowed time for rectification proceedings and ordered the infringement claim to be stayed for three months while allowing the passing off claim to proceed separately. The revision petition was disposed of with these modifications.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Patent tussle: Delhi High Court refuses to lift injunction against Canva</p> <p>Canva Pty Ltd and Ors. vs. Rxprism Health Systems Private Limited and Ors. (MANU/DE/0556/2026; 2026: DHC:659-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Canva Pty Ltd against an interim injunction granted to Rxprism Health Systems, which alleged that Canva's "Present and Record" feature infringed its Indian Patent No. 360726. The court examined whether Canva's feature appropriated the essential elements of Rxprism's patented system, focusing on the layered media architecture and interactive elements. The court found that the learned Single Judge had correctly applied the principles of patent infringement and the Doctrine of Equivalents, determining that Canva's product did infringe the patent. The appeal was dismissed, upholding the injunction and requiring Canva to deposit Rs. 50 lakhs as security.</p>
<p>Two patents, two outcomes: Delhi High Court upholds one injunction, remands other</p> <p>Neway Industries Pvt. Ltd. vs. Mold-Tek Packaging Limited (MANU/DE/0702/2026; 2026: DHC:72-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Neway Industries Pvt. Ltd. and Mold-Tek Packaging Limited regarding alleged patent infringement. Mold-Tek claimed Neway infringed its patents IN 401417 and IN 298724. The court upheld the interim injunction against Neway for IN 401417, finding no credible challenge to its validity and confirming infringement. However, for IN 298724, the court remanded the issue of patent validity back to the Commercial Court for reconsideration, while maintaining the finding of infringement. The ex parte interim order was revived, and the parties were directed to appear before the Commercial Court for further proceedings.</p>
<p>Non-use costs registration: Delhi High Court removes "BANDOOK" trademark</p> <p>Yashasvi Havelia vs. Prabhtej Bhatia and Ors. (MANU/DE/0719/2026; 2026: DHC:884)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a rectification petition filed by Yashasvi Havelia against Prabhtej Bhatia and others, seeking the removal of the trademark 'BANDOOK' registered under Class 33 for non-use. The court found that Bhatia had not used the trademark for over five years, as required under Section 47(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, and had not contested the petition, leading to the presumption of non-use. Citing precedents like Russell Corp and Kiranakart, the court ordered the removal of the trademark from the register, thereby granting relief to Havelia.</p>
<p>Trademark removed for non-use, rules Delhi High Court</p> <p>Wilhelmsen Ships Service AS vs. Vishal Anand Trading AS SBA and Ors. (MANU/DE/0720/2026; 2026: DHC: 857)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a rectification petition filed by Wilhelmsen Ships Service AS against Vishal Anand Trading AS SBA and others, seeking removal of the trademark "SBA" from the Register of Trade Marks under Sections 47 and 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, due to non-use by the respondent for goods in Class 22. The court found that the respondent did not file a reply, thus admitting the petitioner's claims of non-use. Citing precedents like DORCO Co. Ltd. v. Durga Enterprises, the court held that the trademark was liable to be removed for non-use. The petition was allowed, and the Trade Marks Registry was directed to remove the impugned mark within two months.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Family feud over brand: Delhi High Court restrains use of “DASAPRAKASH”</p> <p>Dasaprakash Restaurant and Ice Cream Parlour Pvt Ltd and Ors. vs. Mysore Dasaprakash and Ors. (MANU/DE/0453/2026; 2026: DHC:537-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the dispute between Dasaprakash Restaurant and Ice Cream Parlour Pvt Ltd and Mysore Dasaprakash regarding the use of the "DASAPRAKASH" trademark. The core issue was whether the appellants had the right to use the trademark after K. Balakrishna Rao, a family member and shareholder, was adjudged insolvent. The court found that the appellants could not claim rights to the trademark as Balakrishna Rao was not a majority shareholder and was legally incompetent to transfer rights due to his insolvency. The court upheld the interim injunction against the appellants, restraining them from using the trademark, and dismissed the appeals, allowing the respondents' request for interim relief. The decision was influenced by a prior judgment from the High Court of Madras, which found against the appellants' entitlement to the trademark.</p>
<p>Registered proprietor prevails: Delhi High Court rejects NOKUF infringement claim</p> <p>Sana Herbals Private Limited vs. Mohsin Dehlvi and Ors. (MANU/DE/0019/2026; 2026: DHC:7-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Sana Herbals Private Limited against Mohsin Dehlvi and Dehlvi Remedies Pvt Ltd, focusing on the alleged infringement and passing off of the trademark NOKUF. The court found that since the trademark NOKUF was registered in favor of the respondents since 1996, no infringement claim could be sustained against them, as per the precedent set in S. Syed Mohideen v. P. Sulochana Bai. The court also determined that the appellant failed to establish a prima facie case for passing off, as the respondents' prior use of the trademark predated the appellant's use. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed, and the interim injunction sought by the appellant was denied.</p>
<p>“Copy-paste order”: Delhi High Court remands patent opposition decision</p> <p>ITC Limited vs. The Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs and Ors. (MANU/DE/0486/2026; 2026: DHC:569)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by ITC Limited against the Assistant Controller of Patents and Designs, challenging the rejection of their post-grant opposition to Patent No. 377333 held by Philip Morris Products S.A. The court found that the Controller's order was a verbatim copy of the patentee's submissions, lacking independent analysis. Citing precedents like Synthes GMBH and Huhtamaki Oyj, the court quashed the order and remanded the case for reconsideration, instructing the Controller to conduct a fresh hearing and issue a reasoned decision within eight weeks.</p>
<p>Registered owner protected: Delhi High Court clears use of “CHEETAL” mark</p> <p>Bhole Nath Foods Ltd vs. Kirorimal Kashiram Marketing and Agencies Pvt Ltd (MANU/DE/0231/2026; 2026: DHC:233-DB)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Bhole Nath Foods Ltd (BNF) against an interim injunction granted to Kirorimal Kashiram Marketing and Agencies Pvt Ltd (KKM) by the Commercial Court, which restrained BNF from using the "CHEETAL" mark for rice. The court found that BNF, as the registered proprietor of the "CHEETAL" mark, had the exclusive right to use it, and no infringement action could lie against a registered trademark. The court also determined that KKM failed to establish a case of passing off, as there was no deceptive similarity or evidence of goodwill in KKM's "DOUBLE DEER" mark. Consequently, the High Court quashed the Commercial Court's order, dismissing KKM's application for an injunction.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Medicinal marks clash: Bombay High Court injuncts “ZEROVOL-P”</p> <p>IPCA Laboratories Limited vs. Anrose Pharma (MANU/MH/0004/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the issue of trademark infringement and passing off between IPCA Laboratories Limited and Anrose Pharma. The court found that Anrose Pharma's use of the mark "ZEROVOL-P" was deceptively similar to IPCA's registered trademark "ZERODOL," both used for medicinal products, leading to a likelihood of confusion. The court relied on precedents emphasizing phonetic and visual similarities in trademarks. The suit was decreed in favor of IPCA, granting a permanent injunction against Anrose Pharma and awarding costs of Rs. 15,00,000 to IPCA, with interest applicable if unpaid within eight weeks.</p>
<p>“EMCURE” vs “EMSURE”: Delhi High Court grants injunction</p> <p>Emcure Pharmaceuticals Limited vs. Emsure Pharmaceutical Private Limited (MANU/DE/0522/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed a trademark infringement dispute between Emcure Pharmaceuticals Limited and Emsure Pharmaceutical Private Limited, focusing on whether Emsure's use of a similar trademark constituted infringement and passing off. Emcure, established in 1981, claimed exclusive rights to the trademark EMCURE, registered in multiple classes, and alleged that Emsure's EMSURE mark was deceptively similar, causing consumer confusion. The court found merit in Emcure's claims, noting Emsure's absence from proceedings and the similarity of the marks, and decreed in favor of Emcure, granting an injunction and awarding costs, with instructions for Emcure to file a bill of costs for computation.</p>
<p>Delay hurts case: Bombay High Court denies interim relief</p> <p>Minco India Private Limited vs. Minco India Flow Elements Private Limited (MANU/MH/0039/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a trademark infringement and passing off dispute between Minco India Private Limited and Minco India Flow Elements Private Limited. The core issue was whether the defendant's use of the "MINCO" mark as part of its trade name infringed the plaintiff's registered trademark "MINCO INDIA." The court found that both companies, part of the GICON consortium, had been using similar marks since 2012, with the plaintiff aware of the defendant's use. The court noted the plaintiff's delay and suppression of facts, ruling against granting interim relief. The court emphasized the principles of equity and balance of convenience, referencing precedents like Power Control Appliances and Others. The interim application was dismissed.</p>
<p>Copyright breach proved: Bombay High Court backs producer</p> <p>Radhakrishna Productions Pvt. Ltd. vs. Ikkon Films Pvt. Ltd. and Ors (MANU/MH/0078/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between Radhakrishna Productions Pvt. Ltd. and Ikkon Films Pvt. Ltd. regarding the breach of a Copyright Assignment Agreement and a Film Finance Agreement related to the films "Will You Marry Me" and "Joker." The court found that Radhakrishna Productions had paid Rs. 3,85,17,289 under these agreements, which were valid and binding, and that Ikkon Films had breached the agreements by assigning rights to third parties. The court decreed in favor of Radhakrishna Productions, granting reliefs including declarations of rights and injunctions, and ordered Ikkon Films to pay costs of Rs. 10,00,000.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p>Undertaking breached: Bombay High Court injuncts defendants, imposes heavy costs</p> <p>Laboratoires Griffon Private Limited and Ors. vs. Rajiv Mukul and Ors (MANU/MH/0173/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between Laboratoires Griffon Private Limited and Rajiv Mukul regarding the alleged infringement of the trademark "GLIMET" by the defendants' use of "GLYNET" and "GLYZET." The court found that the defendants breached a prior undertaking to cease using "GLYNET" and deceptively adopted "GLYZET," which was similar to the plaintiffs' trademark. The court granted an interim injunction against the defendants, ordered them to pay costs of Rs. 50,00,000, and directed further action under Section 379 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for false statements made on oath.</p>
<p>Well-known mark protected: Bombay High Court restrains use of "Siyaram"</p> <p>Siyaram Silk Mills Limited vs. Stanford Siyaram Fashion Private Limited and Ors (MANU/MH/0175/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Siyaram Silk Mills Limited and Stanford Siyaram Fashion Private Limited regarding the alleged infringement and passing off of the "Siyaram" trademark. The court found that Siyaram Silk Mills Limited, as the registered proprietor of the "Siyaram" trademark since 1986, had established substantial goodwill and reputation. The defendants' use of the name "Siyaram" was deemed dishonest, as it was adopted with full knowledge of the plaintiff's prior rights. The court rejected the defendants' defenses, including claims of prior use and delay, and granted interim relief to the plaintiff, restraining the defendants from using the "Siyaram" mark. The decision referenced precedents such as Siyaram Silk Mills Ltd. v. Shree Siyaram Fab Pvt. Ltd. and emphasized the irrelevance of honest adoption in cases of infringement.</p>
<p>Patent authority pulled up for procedural lapses by Bombay High Court</p> <p>Trutech Machinery vs. Controller Patents and Ors. (MANU/MH/0175/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Bombay addressed the dispute between Siyaram Silk Mills Limited and Stanford Siyaram Fashion Private Limited regarding the alleged infringement and passing off of the "Siyaram" trademark. The court found that Siyaram Silk Mills Limited, as the registered proprietor of the "Siyaram" trademark since 1986, had established substantial goodwill and reputation. The defendants' use of the name "Siyaram" was deemed dishonest, as it was adopted with full knowledge of the plaintiff's prior rights. The court rejected the defendants' defenses, including claims of prior use and delay, and granted interim relief to the plaintiff, restraining the defendants from using the "Siyaram" mark. The decision referenced precedents such as Siyaram Silk Mills Ltd. v. Shree Siyaram Fab Pvt. Ltd. and emphasized the irrelevance of honest adoption in cases of infringement.</p>
<p>Patent fight paused: Delhi High Court stays infringement ruling</p> <p>Automat Irrigation Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. vs. Aquestia Limited and Ors. (MANU/DE/0020/2026)</p>	<p>The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Automat Irrigation Pvt. Ltd. and others against Aquestia Limited and others, challenging a Single Judge's decision that their "Hydromat Valve" infringed Aquestia's Indian Patent IN 427050. The court found that the Single Judge erred by limiting the infringement analysis to a specific claim portion and conflating distinct features of the valves. Citing the Supreme Court's guidance in Wander Ltd v. Antox India P. Ltd, the court stayed the impugned judgment, noting significant differences between the products and setting the matter for further hearing on February 9, 2026.</p>

Case Name and Citation	Case Brief
<p data-bbox="271 288 792 484">No trans-border reputation proved: Delhi High Court restores "BLUE-JAY" trademark</p> <p data-bbox="271 554 779 702">Sumit Vijay and Ors. vs. Major League Baseball and Ors. (MANU/DE/0021/2026)</p>	<p data-bbox="833 218 2145 758">The High Court of Delhi addressed the appeal by Sumit Vijay and others against Major League Baseball and others, focusing on the removal of the "BLUE-JAY" trademark from the Register of Trademarks. The core issue was whether the appellants' trademark was adopted in bad faith and if it infringed on the respondent's "BLUE JAYS" mark, which was claimed to have trans-border reputation in India. The court found no evidence of the respondent's mark having goodwill or reputation in India prior to the appellants' registration and held that the adoption of the "BLUE-JAY" mark was not in bad faith. Consequently, the court set aside the earlier judgment, restoring the appellants' trademark to the register.</p>