



***Refresher Programme for Commercial
Participants: District Judge (Commercial Courts)***

**On
7th November 2020**

***Delhi Judicial Academy, Dwarka, Sector - 14,
New Delhi - 110078***

For Private and Internal Circulation only



INDEX

A. STATUTES REFERRED

S. No.	Title
1.	Biological Diversity Act, 2002
2.	Code of Civil Procedure, 1908
3.	Constitution of India, 1950
4.	Copyright Act, 1957
5.	Designs Act, 2000
6.	Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration & Protection) Act, 1999
7.	Indian Contract Act, 1872
8.	Indian Evidence Act, 1872
9.	Information Technology Act, 2000
10.	Patents Act, 1970
11.	Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001
12.	Semiconductor Integrated Circuits Layout Design Act, 2000
13.	Specific Relief Act, 1963
14.	Trademarks Act, 1999

B. RULES

S. No.	Title
1.	Biological Diversity Rules, 2004
2.	Copyright Rules, 2013
3.	Designs (Amendment) Rules, 2014
4.	Designs Rules, 2001
5.	Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration & Protection) Rules, 2002
6.	Information Technology (Intermediaries Guidelines) Rules, 2011
7.	Intellectual Property Rights (Imported Goods) Enforcement Rules, 2007
8.	Patents (Amendment) Rules, 2014
9.	Patents Rules, 2003
10.	Trade Marks Rules, 2017

C. INTERNATIONAL TREATIES/ CONVENTION

S. No.	Title
1.	Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, 1883
2.	Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, 1886
3.	Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), 1967
4.	Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), 1970
5.	Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms, 1971
6.	Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Micro-organisms for the Purposes of



	Patent Procedure, 1977
7.	Nairobi Treaty on the Protection of the Olympic Symbol, 1981
8.	Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks, 1989
9.	Washington Treaty on Intellectual Property in respect of Integrated Circuits, 1989
10.	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement), 1994
11.	World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement, 1994
12.	Doha Declaration on the TRIPS agreement and Public Health, 2001
13.	Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works for Persons Who are Blind, Visually Impaired, or Otherwise Print Disabled, 2013 (Adopted)

D. REPORTS & MANUALS

S. No.	Title	Author	Source
1.	National Intellectual Property Rights Policy, 2016	Ministry of Commerce and Industry Department of Industrial Policy & Promotion, Government of India	http://dipp.gov.in/English/Schemes/Intellectual_Property_Rights/National_IPR_Policy_12.05.2016.pdf
2.	Discussion paper on Standard Essential Patents and their availability on FRAND terms	Government of India Department of Industrial Policy and Promotion Ministry of Commerce & Industry	http://www.ipindia.nic.in/writereaddata/Portal/News/196_1_standardEssentialPaper_01_March2016_1_.pdf
3.	National IPR Policy (First Draft), 2014	Prabha Sridevan, Former Judge, Madras High Court	http://dipp.nic.in/English/Schemes/Intellectual_Property_Rights/IPR_Policy_24December2014.pdf
4.	188 th Law Commission Report on Proposals for Constitution of Hi-Tech Fast-Track Commercial divisions in High Courts	Law Commission of India, Government of India	http://lawcommissionofindia.nic.in/
5.	Manual Of Geographical Indications Practice And Procedure	Office Of The Controller General Of Patents, Designs And Trademarks & Registrar Of Geographical Indications	Version 01.11 As modified on July 26, 2011

E. CASE LAWS

a) IPR and E-commerce

S. No.	Title	Citation
a)	E-commerce & Liability of Intermediary	
	High Court of Delhi	



1.	<i>Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd. v. Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.</i> (¶¶117-129)	2020(81)PTC399(Del)
2.	<i>Amway India Enterprises Pvt.Ltd. v.IMG Technologies Pvt.Ltd.</i>	260 (2019) DLT690
3.	<i>Skullcandy Inc. vs. Shri Shyam Telecom and Ors.</i> (¶19)	2019 (77) PTC 155 (Del)
4.	<i>L'oreal v. Brandworld & ANR.</i> (¶¶64,66)	254 (2018) DLT 433
5.	<i>Christian Louboutin Sas v.Nakul Bajaj & Ors</i> (¶¶27-28)	253 (2018) DLT 728
6.	<i>Luxottica Group S.P.A. v. Mify Solutions Pvt. Ltd.</i> (¶17)	254 (2018) DLT 472
7.	<i>Kent RO Systems Ltd. and Ors. v. Amit Kotak and Ors.</i> (¶34)	2017 (69) PTC 551 (Del)
8.	<i>My Space Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd.</i> (¶¶77-78)	236 (2017) DLT 478
9.	<i>Swami Ramdev and Ors. vs. Facebook, Inc. and Ors.</i> (¶¶76-81,84)	263 (2019) DLT 689

b) Injunction Orders

S. No	Title	Citation
a)	John Doe/ Ashok Kumar Orders & Anton Piller Orders	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>ESPN Software India Private Ltd. v. Tudu Enterprise and Ors.</i> (¶¶28-30)	MANU/DE/1061/2011
2.	<i>Taj Television Ltd. & Anr. v. Rajan Mandal & Ashok Kumar</i> (¶¶17,18)	2003 FSR 22
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Balaji Motion Pictures Limited v. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Ltd</i> (¶9)	MANU/MH/3469/2016 (Bom)
2.	<i>Bucyrus Europe Limited and Ors. v. Vulcan Industries Engineering Company Private Limited</i> (Calcutta) (¶27)	2005 (30) PTC 279 (Cal)
	Foreign Judgments	
1.	<i>Yousuf v Salama</i> (United Kingdom)	(1980) 3 All ER 405
2.	<i>Anton Piller KG v Manufacturing Process</i> (United Kingdom)	(1976) 1 All ER 779
3.	<i>EMI v Pandit</i> (United Kingdom)	(1975) 1 All ER 418
4.	<i>BMG Canada Inc. v. John Doe.</i> (Canada)	[2004] F.C.J. No. 525 (QL)
b)	Dynamic Injunction	

	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>UTV Software Communication Ltd. and Ors. v. 1337X to and Ors.</i> (¶¶99-101)	2019(78)PTC375(Del)
2.	<i>Tata Sky Limited v. National Internet Exchange of India (Nixi) And Ors</i> (¶¶18-21)	259(2019)DLT468
	Foreign Judgments	
1.	<i>Disney Enterprise v. MI Ltd.</i> (Singapore High Court)	(2018) SGHC 206
c)	Anti-Suit Injunction	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Modi Entertainment Network and Ors. v. W.S.G. Cricket PTE. Ltd.</i> (¶¶33-34)	AIR2003SC1177
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>HT Media Limited v. Brainlink International Inc.</i> (¶¶29-32, 44-45)	CS (COMM) 119/2020 Dated: 28.04.2020
2.	<i>M/S Indiabulls Real Estate Ltd. v M/S Veritas Investment Research Corporation & Ors.</i> (¶¶33-34)	2019 SCC OnLine Del 8294
	Foreign Judgments	
1.	<i>John Reginald Stott Kirkham and others v Trane US Inc and others</i> (Singapore Supreme Court)	[2009] 4 SLR(R) 428 at [44]
d)	Interlocutory Injunction	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Wander Ltd. and Ors. v. Antox India P. Ltd</i> (¶9)	1990 (2) ARBLR 399 (SC)
e)	Mareva / Freezing Injunction	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Rite Approach Group Ltd. v. Rosoboronexport</i> (¶6)	AIR 2007 Delhi 145
	Other High Court	
1.	<i>Iridium India Telecom Limited v. Motorola Inc. a Corporation and Ors</i> (¶¶46-49)	2003(6)BomCR511
	Foreign Court	

1.	<i>Mareva Compania Naviera SA v International Bulkcarriers SA</i> <i>The Mareva</i>	[1980] 1 All ER 213
----	--	---------------------

c) Jurisdiction

S. No.	Title	Citation
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Dhodha House and Ors. vs. S.K. Maingi and Ors.</i> (¶¶18-20)	AIR 2006 SC 730
2.	<i>Exphar SA and Ors. vs. Eupharma Laboratories Ltd. and Ors.</i>	AIR 2004 SC 1682
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Juggernaut Books Pvt. Ltd. v. Inkmango inc. and ors.</i> (¶20)	CS (COMM) 421/2019 DOD: 09.08.2019
2.	<i>Exxon Mobil Corporation v. Exxoncorp Private Limited</i> (¶¶23,27)	2019 (79) PTC 335 (Del)
3.	<i>Burger King Corporation v. Techchand Shewakramani and Ors.</i> (¶¶18,21,23,25)	2019 II AD (Delhi)106
4.	<i>Millennium and Copthorne International Limited v. Aryans Plaza Services Private Limited and Ors.</i> (¶26)	MANU/DE/1854/2018
5.	<i>Banyan Tree Holding (P) Limited v. A. Murali Krishna Reddy and Anr.</i> (¶¶42,45)	2010 (42) PTC 361 (Del)
6.	<i>The Jay Engineering Works Ltd. vs. Ramesh Aggarwal</i>	2006 (33) PTC 561 (Del)

d) Copyright Act, 1957

S. No.	Title	Citation
a.	Objectives of Copyright Law	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Eastern Book Company v. DB Modak</i> (¶¶ 56, 57)	(2008) 1 SCC 1
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Time Warner Entertainment Company v. RPG Netcom</i> (¶¶ 9, 18)	2007 (34) PTC 668
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Amir Raza Husain v. Cinevistaas Limited</i> (¶31)	2003 (27) PTC 425 (Bom)
2.	<i>Sulamangalam R. Jayalakshmi v. Meta Musicals Chennai</i> (¶¶ 69, 70)	2000 PTC 681
3.	<i>N.T. Raghunathan v. All India Reporter Ltd. Bombay</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	AIR 1971 Bom 48
b.	Original Literary Works/ Test of Originality	
	Supreme Court	



1.	<i>Entertainment Network (India) Ltd. v. Super Cassette Industries Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 44-46)	2008 (37) PTC 353
2.	<i>Eastern Book Company v. DB Modak</i> (¶¶ 8-11)	(2008) 1 SCC 1
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Time Warner Entertainment Company v. RPG Netcom</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	2007 (34) PTC 668
2.	<i>Camlin Private Ltd. v. National Pencil Industries</i> (¶ 2)	1987 (7) PTC 1 (Del)
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Periyar Self Respect Propaganda v. Periyar Dravidar Kazhagam</i> (¶¶ 21, 22)	2010 (44) PTC 422 (Mad)
2.	<i>Shyam Lal v. Gaya Pasad</i> (¶¶ 14, 15)	AIR 1971 All 192
3.	<i>Macmillan v. Cooper</i> (¶¶ 17, 36)	AIR 1924 PC 75 (Bom)
	English case	
1.	<i>University of London Press Ltd. v. University Tutorial Press Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 13,14)	(1916) 2 Ch 601
c.	Ownership of Copyright	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Vicco Laboratories v. Art Commercial Advertising</i> (¶¶ 9, 10)	AIR 2001 SC 2753
2.	<i>RG Anand v. Delux Films</i> (¶¶ 20, 57, 58)	AIR 1978 SC 1613
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Diljeet Titus Advocate v. Alfd A Adebare</i> (¶¶ 34, 35)	2006 (32) PTC 609
2.	<i>Najma Heptulla v. Orient Longman</i> (¶¶ 16, 17, 37, 38)	AIR 1989 Delhi 63
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Gee Pee Films Private Ltd. v. Pratik Chowdhury</i> (¶¶ 22, 23) (Calcutta)	2002 (24) PTC 392
	English case	
1.	<i>University of London Press Ltd. v. University Tutorial Press Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 31, 32)	(1916) 2 Ch 601
d.	Author's Moral Rights	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Amarnath Sehgal v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 27, 28, 62)	2005 (30) PTC 25
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Arun Chadha v. OCA Productions Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 12, 13, 14)	2013 (53) PTC 401
2.	<i>PEE PEE Publishers and Distributors v. Neena Khanna</i>	2010 (44) PTC 45



	(¶¶ 25,26, 49)	
3.	<i>Manu Bhandari v. Kala Vikas Pictures Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 25, 27)	AIR 1987 Del 13
4.	<i>Wiley Eastern Limited v. Indian Institute of Management</i> (¶¶ 25, 26)	(1995) 58 DLT 449
	Other High Courts	
	<i>Sajeev Pillai vs Venu Kunnapalli</i> (¶¶8,10)	MANU/KE/5406/2019
e.	Assignment of Copyright	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Indian Performing Rights Society Ltd. v. Eastern India Motion Pictures Association</i> (¶¶ 23-25)	(1977) 2 SCC 820
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Orient Longman Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11-14)	2003 (26) PTC 186
2.	<i>Rishi Raj v. International Films Distributors</i> (¶¶ 3, 4)	2002 (24) PTC 541
3.	<i>KPM Sundaram v. Rattan Prakashan Mandir</i> (¶¶ 12, 13)	AIR 1983 Del 461
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Saregama India Ltd. v. Suresh Jindal</i> (¶¶ 40, 65)	2007 (34) PTC 522 (Cal)
2.	<i>Deshmukh and Co. Private Ltd. v. Avinash Vishnu Khandekar</i> (¶¶ 40, 41)	2006 (32) PTC 358
3.	<i>Sulamangalam R Jayalakshmi v. Meta Musicals Chennai</i> (¶¶ 70, 71)	2000 PTC 681
4.	<i>Video Master v. Nishi Productions</i> (¶¶ 7-9)	1998 (18) PTC 117 (Bom)
5.	<i>Gramophone Company of India Ltd. v. Shanti Film Corporation</i> (¶¶ 22, 26)	AIR 1997 Cal 63
f.	Compulsory Licenses	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Entertainment Network (India) v. Super Cassette Industries</i> (¶¶ 68, 69, 72, 74, 75)	(2008) 13 SCC 30
2.	<i>Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. vs. Music Broadcast Pvt. Ltd.</i> (¶¶56-58)	AIR2012SC2144
3.	<i>Entertainment Network (India) Ltd. and Ors. v. Super Cassette Industries Ltd. and Ors.</i> (¶¶63,64,68-71,74,80,102)	(2008)13SCC30
	High Court of Delhi	
4.	<i>Super Cassette Industries Ltd. v. Bathla Cassette Industries Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 35, 36)	2003 (27) PTC 280
5.	<i>Gramophone Company of India v. Super Cassette Industries</i> (¶¶ 24-26)	1996 (16) PTC 252

	Other High Courts	
6.	<i>Tips Industries Ltd. v. Wynn Music Ltd. and Ors.</i> (¶¶72) (Bombay High Court)	MANU/MH/0862/2019
g.	Infringement of Copyright	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Krishika Lulla and Ors. v. Shyam Vithalrao Devkatta & Ors.</i> (¶¶ 8, 11, 13, 20)	(2016) 2 SCC 521
2.	<i>RG Anand v. Delux Films</i> (¶¶ 20, 57, 58)	AIR 1978 SC 1613
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Super Cassettes Industries Ltd. v. M/s Shreya Bhattacharya Pvt. Ltd</i>	258(2019)DLT116
2.	<i>IGNOU vs. Dominant Publishers and Distributors</i> (¶¶16)	MANU/DE/1739/2019
3.	<i>Adidas AG and Ors. v. Praveen Kumar and Ors.</i> (¶¶18-20)	2019(78)PTC468(Del)
4.	<i>Allied Blenders and Distillers Pvt. Ltd. v. Rangar Breweries Ltd.</i> (¶¶10)	2019(78)PTC653(Del)
5.	<i>Rasmala Trade Finance Fund v. Raman Gupta</i>	MANU/DE/2344/2019
6.	<i>Exxon Mobil Corporation v. Exxoncorp Private Limited</i> (¶¶26)	MANU/DE/2262/2019
7.	<i>Arun Chopra v. Kaka-Ka Dhaba Pvt Ltd & Ors</i> (¶¶10)	2019(77)PTC268(Del)
8.	<i>Super Cassettes Industries Pvt. Ltd. v. M/s I- Vision Digital LLP</i> (¶¶6-8)	MANU/DE/4205/2018
9.	<i>The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services</i> (¶¶¶ 96, 97, 99)	233(2016)DLT279 (SJ)
10.	<i>The Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Oxford v. Rameshwari Photocopy Services</i> (¶¶¶ 27, 28, 30, 79, 80)	235 (2016) DLT 409 (DB)
11.	<i>Super Cassette Industries v. Hamar Television Network</i> (¶¶¶ 8-11)	2011(45)PTC70
12.	<i>Super Cassette Industries v. Myspace Inc.</i> (¶¶¶ 96-98)	2011 (48) PTC 49
13.	<i>John Wiley v. Prabhat Chander Kumar Jain</i> (¶¶¶ 88, 109, 91, 92, 93)	2010 (44) PTC 675 (Del.)
14.	<i>Warner Bros. Entertainment v. Santosh VG</i> (¶¶¶ 67, 85, 86)	2009 SCC Online Del. 835
15.	<i>Anil Gupta v. Kunal Dasgupta</i> (¶¶¶ 29, 30, 51)	AIR 2002 Delhi 379
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Fermat Education v. M/s Sorting Hat Technologies Ltd</i> (¶¶36)	C.S. No.330/2018 (Mad) DoD: 13.08.2018
2.	<i>Ramesh Sippy v. Shaan Ranjeet Uttamsingh</i> (¶¶¶ 20, 43, 53, 54)	2013 (55) PTC 95 (Bom)
3.	<i>Urmi Juvekar Chiang v. Global Broadcast News</i> (¶¶¶ 18, 29, 26)	2008 (36) PTC 377 (Bom)
4.	<i>Euro Kids International v. India Book Distributors</i> (¶¶¶ 23, 26)	2005 (6) Bom CR 198
5.	<i>Barbara Taylor Bradford v. Sahara Media Entertainment</i> (¶¶¶ 142, 143)	2004 (28) PTC 474 (Cal)
6.	<i>Shyam Lal v. Gaya Prasad</i> (¶¶¶ 14-15)	AIR 1971 All 192

6.	<i>V Govindan v. Gopalakrishna</i> (¶¶ 12-13)	AIR 1955 Mad 391
h.	Passing Off	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Super Cassette Industries v. Hamar Television Network</i> (¶¶ 8-11)	2011(45)PTC70
2.	<i>Time Warner Entertainment Company v. RPG Netcom</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	2007 (34) PTC 668
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Bharati Cellular v. Jai Distillers</i> (¶¶ 18, 19)	2006 (33) PTC 220
i.	Preventive Civil Remedies/ Damages for Infringement	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Gujarat Bottling Company Ltd. v. Coca Cola Company</i> (¶¶ 46, 47)	AIR 1995 SC 2372
2.	<i>Dalpat Kumar v. Prahlad Singh</i> (¶¶ 13, 14)	(1992) 1 SCC 719
3.	<i>Wander Ltd. v. Antox India Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶10, 11)	1990 (Supp) SCC 727
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Super Cassette Industries v. Nirulas Corner House Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 20-22)	2008 (37) PTC 237
2.	<i>Microsoft Corporation v. K Mayuri</i> (¶¶ 21-24)	2007 (35) PTC 415
3.	<i>Mirabai Films Private Ltd. v. Hathway Cable and Datacom Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 15-16)	2002 (25) PTC 148
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>RM Subbiah v. N Sankaran Nair</i> (¶¶13-14)	AIR 1979 Mad 56
j.	Preventive Civil Remedies for Passing off	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Laxmikant V. Patel v. Chetanbhat Shah & Ors.</i> (¶¶13,16)	AIR 2002 SC 275
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Burger King Corporation vs. Techchand Shewakramani and Ors.</i> (¶¶25,26)	2019 II AD (Delhi)106
k.	Fair Dealing	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Academy of General Edu., Manipal and Ors. vs. B. Malini Mallya</i> (¶20)	AIR 2009 SC 1982
2.	<i>Eastern Book Company v. DB Modak</i> (¶38)	(2008) 1 SCC 1
	High Court of Delhi	



1.	<i>Raj Rewal vs. Union of India and Ors.</i> (¶30)	260 (2019) DLT 190
2.	<i>The Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of University of Oxford and Ors. vs. Rameshwari Photocopy Services and Ors.</i> (¶¶34,39,47)	235 (2016) DLT 409
3.	<i>Syndicate of The Press of The Universtiy of Cambridge on Behalf of The Chancellor, Masters and School and Ors. vs. B.D. Bhandari and Ors.</i> (¶¶34-37)	185 (2011) DLT 346
	Foreign Judgment	
1.	<i>CCH Canadian Ltd. v. Law Society of Upper Canada</i> (¶53) (Supreme Court of Canada)	2004 SCC 13
I.	Designs and Copyright	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Microfibres Inc v. Girdhar and Co. and Ors.</i>	2006 (2) RCR (Civil) 40
2.	<i>Kiran Shoes Manufacturers vs. Registrar of Copyrights & Anr.</i>	2013 (54) PTC 386 (Del)

e) Trademark Act, 1999

S. No.	Title	Citation
a.	Objectives of Trademark Law	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Laxmikant Patel v. Chetanbhat Shah</i> (¶¶ 16, 17)	AIR 2002 SC 275
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Cadbury India Ltd. v. Neeraj Food Products</i> (¶¶ 80-82)	2007 (35) PTC 95
2.	<i>Kanungo Media Private Ltd. v. RGV Film Factory</i> (¶¶ 36, 37)	2007 (34) PTC 591
3.	<i>Biswaroop Roy Chourdary v. Karan Johar</i> (¶¶ 11, 12)	2006 (33) PTC 381
4.	<i>Corning Inc.v Raj Kumar Garg</i> (¶¶ 16-18)	2004 (28) PTC 527
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Carrefour v. V Subramaniam</i> (¶¶ 43, 44)	2007 (35) PTC 225 (Mad)
b.	Domain Name	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶12, 32, 34)	(2004) 6 SCC 145
	High Court of Delhi	

1.	<i>Arun Jaitley v. Network Solutions Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 21, 22)	2011 (47) PTC 1
2.	<i>Celador Productions Ltd. v. Gaurav Mehrotra</i> (¶¶ 8-9)	2003 (26) PTC 140
3.	<i>Dr. Reddy's Laboratories v. Manu Kosuri</i> (¶¶ 6, 7)	2001 (58) DRJ 241
4.	<i>Tata Sons v. Manu Kosuri</i> (¶¶ 42, 43)	2001 PTC 432
5.	<i>Yahoo Inc. V. Akash Arora</i> (¶¶ 13-16)	1999 (19) PTC 201
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Rediff Communications Ltd. v. Cyberbooth</i> (¶¶ 20-21)	AIR 2000 Bom 27
2.	<i>I Plus Inc. V. Consim Info Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11, 23-26)	2010 (42) PTC 50 (Bom)
c.	Descriptive Trademark	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Godfrey Philips India Ltd v. Girnar Food and Beverages Co.</i> (¶¶ 3, 4)	(2004) 5 SCC 257
2.	<i>NR Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation</i> (¶¶ 21-23)	1996 PTC (16) 583
3.	<i>JR Kapoor v. Micromix India</i> (¶¶ 4-6)	1994 Supp (3) SCC 215
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Cadila Healthcare Ltd. v. Gujarat Co-operative Milk Marketing Foundation Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11-14)	2008 (36) PTC 168
2.	<i>Evergreen Sweet House v. Evergreen and Others</i> (¶¶ 23, 24)	2008 (38) PTC 325
3.	<i>NR Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation</i> (¶¶ 21, 22)	AIR 1995 Delhi 300
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Hindustan Development Corporation Ltd. v. The Deputy Registrar of Trademarks</i> (¶¶ 10, 14, 15)	AIR 1955 Cal 519
d.	Infringement of Trademark	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Parle Products Private Ltd. v. JP and Co.</i> (¶¶ 7-9)	(1972) I SCC 618
2.	<i>KR Chinna Krishna Chettiar v. Sri Ambal and Co.</i> (¶¶ 9-11)	AIR 1970 SC 146
3.	<i>Kaviraj Pandit Durga Dutt Sharma vs. Navaratna Pharmaceutical Laboratories</i> (¶ 29)	AIR 1965 SC 980
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Bennett Coleman & Co. Ltd. v. ARG Outlier Media Pvt Ltd & Ors</i> (¶¶ 35, 45, 49,)	CS(COMM) 434/2017 DOD: 23.10.2020
2.	<i>Jagran Prakashan Limited v. Telegram FZ LLC</i>	2020 SCC OnLine Del 615
3.	<i>Make My Trip (INDIA) (P) Ltd. v. Make My Travel (INDIA) (P) Ltd.</i>	2019 SCC OnLine Del

		10638
4.	<i>Facebook Inc. v. Surinder Malik</i>	2019 SCC OnLine Del 9887
5.	<i>Vijay Abbot v. Super Cassettes Industries (P) Ltd.</i>	2019 SCC OnLine Del 9458,
6.	<i>Bigtree Entertainment Pvt. Ltd. v. D. Sharma and Ors. (¶19)</i>	2019(77)PTC411(Del)
7.	<i>Crocs Inc. USA vs. Bata India Ltd. and Ors. (¶31)</i>	2019 (78)PTC 1 (Del)
8.	<i>H&M Hennes & Mauritz AB and Ors.v. HM Megabrands Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. (¶24)</i>	2018(74)PTC229(Del)
9.	<i>Arun Chopra vs. Kaka-Ka Dhaba Pvt. Ltd. and Ors.(¶11)</i>	2019(77)PTC268(Del)
10.	<i>Cargill India Pvt Ltd v. Gati Ltd(¶9)</i>	2019(80)PTC92(Del)
11.	<i>Mankind Pharma Limited versus Lee Pharmaceuticals Of Lee House(¶4)</i>	MANU/DE/2223/2019
12.	<i>Parveen Kumar Jain vs. Rajan Seth and Ors. (¶9)</i>	2019(78)PTC649(Del)
13.	<i>Paridhi Udyog vs. Jagdev Raj Sarwan Ram Dhiman (¶¶29-31)</i>	MANU/DE/1479/2019
14.	<i>XEROX Corporation and Ors. vs. P.K. Khansaheb and Ors. (¶9)</i>	MANU/DE/2217/2019
15.	<i>Elder Projects Ltd. and Ors. vs. Elder Pharmacia LLP and Ors. (¶¶18-22)</i>	MANU/DE/1163/2019
16.	<i>Tata Sons Ltd. vs. Prakash Yadav and Ors. (¶15)</i>	MANU/DE/2376/2019
17.	<i>Patanjali Ayurved Limited vs. Masala King Exports Trading Pvt. Ltd. and Ors. (¶¶16-18)</i>	MANU/DE/1391/2019
18.	<i>Horlicks Ltd. and Ors. vs. Heinz India Pvt. Ltd.</i>	MANU/DE/0944/2019
19.	<i>Mallcom (India) Limited and Ors. vs. Rakesh Kumar and Ors. (¶25)</i>	259(2019)DLT1
20.	<i>Dabur India Ltd. vs. Emami Limited (¶28)</i>	MANU/DE/2112/2019
21.	<i>Burger King Corporation vs Techchand Shewakramani & Ors</i>	253(2018)DLT93
22.	<i>Entertainment Network (India) Ltd. vs. HT Media Limited (¶¶29-33)</i>	251(2018)DLT370
23.	<i>Christian Louboutin Sas v.Ashish Bansal & Anr (¶7)</i>	2018SCCOnLineDel10205
24.	<i>Times Internet v. Jonathan S.(¶¶ 21-23)</i>	2012 (51) PTC 195
25.	<i>Kapil Wadhwa & Ors. vs Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.(¶¶ 51, 75, 82,84)</i>	2012 SCC OnLine Del 5172
26.	<i>United Biotech Private Ltd. v. Orchid Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. (¶¶13, 14)</i>	2012 (50) PTC 433 (DB)
27.	<i>Consitex SA v. Kamini Jain(¶¶ 21, 22)</i>	2011 (47) PTC 337
28.	<i>Tata Sons v. Manoj Dodia(¶¶ 27, 28)</i>	2011 (46) PTC 244
29.	<i>ITC Ltd. v. Philip Morris Products SA(¶¶ 31, 32)</i>	2010 (42) PTC 572
30.	<i>Horlicks v. Kartick Sadhukan(¶¶ 10, 11)</i>	2002 (25) PTC 126
31.	<i>M/s Biofarma v. Sanjay Medical Stores(¶¶ 11, 12)</i>	1997 (17) PTC 355
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Hindustan Unilever Limited v. Emami Limited</i>	2020 SCC OnLine Bom 872
2.	<i>International Society for Krishna Consciousness (ISKCON)</i>	2020 SCC OnLine Bom

	<i>v. Iskcon Appaeral (P) Ltd.</i>	729
3.	<i>Avighna Coffee v. Cothas Coffee</i> (¶¶ 31, 32)	2016(4) AKR 646 (Kar)
4.	<i>B Kishore Jain v. Navratana Khazana Jewellers</i> (¶¶ 20-22)	2008 (37) PTC 536 (Mad)
5.	<i>Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd v. Universal Twin Labs</i> (¶¶ 26, 27)	2008 (36) PTC 675 (Bom)
6.	<i>Health & Glow Retailing Private Ltd. v. Dhiren Krishna Paul</i> (¶¶ 31, 33)	2007 (35) PTC 474 (Mad)
7.	<i>James Chadwick & Bros. Ltd. v. National Sewing Thread Company Ltd.</i>	AIR 1951 Bom 147
e. Defences against Infringement		
Supreme Court		
1.	<i>Midas Hygiene Industries Private Ltd. v. Sudhir Bhatia</i> (¶¶ 10, 11)	(2004) 3 SCC 90
2.	<i>Uniply Industries v. Unicorn Plywood</i> (¶¶ 3, 5, 6)	(2001) 5 SCC 95
High Court of Delhi		
1.	<i>Exide Industries Ltd. v. Exide Corporation, USA</i> (¶¶ 33, 34)	2013 (53) PTC 137
2.	<i>Kapil Wadhwa v. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 31, 32, 68)	2013 (53) PTC 112
3.	<i>Rolex SA v. Alex Jewellery Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 24, 25)	2009 (41) PTC 284
Other High Courts		
1.	<i>Amaravathi Enterprises v. Karaikudi Chettinadu</i> (¶¶ 8-10)	2008 (36) PTC 688 (Mad)
2.	<i>B Kishore Jain v. Navratana Khazana Jewellers</i> (¶¶ 31-33)	2008 (37) PTC 536 (Mad)
3.	<i>Kores (India) Ltd. v. Whale Stationary Products Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 16, 17)	2008 (36) PTC 463 (Bom)
4.	<i>New Hope Food Industries Private Ltd. v. Pioneer Bakeries Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11-13)	2008 (36) PTC 400 (Mad)
5.	<i>Khoday Distilleries v. Scotch Whisky Association</i> (¶¶ 105-107)	AIR 1992 Bom 294
f. Passing Off		
Supreme Court		
1.	<i>S Syed Mohideen v. P Sulochana Bai</i> (¶¶ 22, 24)	2015 (7) SCALE 136
2.	<i>Khoday Distilleries v. Scotch Whisky Association</i> (¶¶ 106-107)	AIR 2008 SC 2737
3.	<i>Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 32, 34)	(2004) 6 SCC 145
4.	<i>Cadila Healthcare Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 42)	(2001) 5 SCC 73
5.	<i>NR Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation</i> (¶¶ 18-20)	(1996) 5 SCC 714
6.	<i>Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satyadeo Gupta</i> (¶¶ 13-16)	AIR 1963 SC 449
High Court of Delhi		
1.	<i>Sun Pharma Laboratories Ltd v. Ajanta Pharma Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 18, 25, 26)	2019 SCC OnLine Del 8443
2.	<i>Louis Vuitton Malletier vs. Iqbal Singh and Ors.</i> (¶ 22)	258(2019)DLT760
3.	<i>Vardhman Buildtech Pvt. Ltd & Ors v. Vardhman Properties Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11-12)	233 (2016) DLT 25

4.	<i>Delhi Public School Society v. DPS World Foundation</i> (¶¶ 43-44)	230 (2016) DLT 5
5.	<i>TV Today Network v. Kesari Singh Gujjar</i> (¶¶ 28, 29)	2013 (56) PTC 359
6.	<i>Reckitt Benkiser v. Hindustan Unilever</i> (¶¶ 20, 21)	2013 (55) PTC 156
7.	<i>Glaxo Group v. Rajesh Bansal</i> (¶¶ 13-14)	2013 (53) PTC 441
8.	<i>Delhi Public School Society v. DPS Trust</i> (¶¶ 7-9)	2013 (53) PTC 449
9.	<i>Cadila Healthcare Ltd. v. Dabur India Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11, 13)	2008 (38) PTC 130
10.	<i>Dr. Reddy's Laboratories v. Manu Kosuri</i> (¶¶ 7-11)	2001 (58) DRJ 241
11.	<i>Tata Sons v. Manu Kosuri</i> (¶¶ 42, 43)	2001 PTC 432
12.	<i>Yahoo Inc. v. Akash Arora</i> (¶¶ 12, 16)	1999 (19) PTC 201
13.	<i>Flamagas, SA vs. Irfan Ahmed and Ors. and Baker Hughes Limited and Ors. vs. Hiroo Khushalani</i> (¶¶ 66)	74 (1998) DLT 715
Other High Courts		
1.	<i>Gorbatschow Wodka KG v. John Distilleries Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 21-24)	2011 (47) PTC 100 (Bom)
g. Civil Remedies/ Damages for Infringement		
Supreme Court		
1.	<i>Ramdev Food Products Pvt. Ltd. v. Arvindbhai Rambhai Patel</i> (¶¶ 30, 50, 72)	AIR 2006 SC 3304
2.	<i>Dhodha House v. S. K. Maingi</i> (¶¶ 37, 40, 47, 48)	(2006) 9 SCC 41
3.	<i>Colgate Palmolive Ltd. v. Hindustan Lever Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 41, 42)	AIR 1999 SC 3105
4.	<i>NR Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation</i> (¶¶ 20, 21)	(1996) 5 SCC 714
5.	<i>Cotton Corporation of India Ltd. v. United Industrial Bank Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 31, 32)	(1983) 4 SCC 625
High Court of Delhi		
1.	<i>Three-N-Products Pvt. Ltd. v. Kairali Exports and Ors. (AYUR CASE)</i> (¶¶ 15-17)	246 (2018) DLT 691
2.	<i>Yahoo Inc v. Rinshad Rinu & Ors.</i> (¶¶ 7, 8)	2017 (71) PTC 608
3.	<i>Icon Health and Fitness v. Sheriff Usman</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	CS (Comm.) 216/2016 DOD: 12.09.2017
4.	<i>Shell Brands International AG v. Pradeep Jain Proprietor Shell Exports</i> (¶¶ 15-17)	2011 (47) PTC 175
5.	<i>Intel Corporation v. Dinakaran Nair</i> (¶¶ 13-14)	2006 (33) PTC 345
6.	<i>Mars Incorporated v. Kumar Krishna Mukherjee</i> (¶¶ 29, 30)	2003 (26) PTC 60
Other High Courts		
1.	<i>Avighna Coffee v. Cothas Coffee</i> (¶¶ 19, 31, 32)	2016 (4) AKR 646 (Kar)
2.	<i>Lupin v. Johnson & Johnson</i> (¶¶ 59, 60)	2015 (61) PTC 1 (Bom)
3.	<i>Som Distilleries v. Sabmiller India</i> (¶¶ 13, 14)	2013 (56) PTC 237 (Bom)
4.	<i>Arviva Industries (India) v. Vikas M. Tulsian</i> (¶¶ 13-15)	2013 (54) PTC 199 (Bom)
5.	<i>Consim Info v. Google India</i> (¶¶ 214, 215)	2011 (45) PTC 575 (Mad)

h.	Design and Trademark	
	Other High Court	
1.	<i>Super Smelters Limited v. SRMB Srijan Private Limited</i>	2020 (81) PTC 101 (Cal)
i.	E-commerce & Liability of Intermediary	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd. v. Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.</i> (¶¶117-129)	2020 (81) PTC 399 (Del)
2.	<i>Amway India Enterprises Pvt.Ltd. v.IMG Technologies Pvt.Ltd.</i>	260 (2019) DLT 690
3.	<i>Skullcandy Inc. vs. Shri Shyam Telecom and Ors.</i> (¶19)	2019 (77) PTC 155 (Del)
4.	<i>L'oreal v. Brandworld & ANR.</i> (¶¶64,66)	254 (2018) DLT 433
5.	<i>Christian Louboutin Sas v.Nakul Bajaj & Ors</i> (¶¶27-28)	253 (2018) DLT 728
6.	<i>Luxottica Group S.P.A. v. Mify Solutions Pvt. Ltd.</i> (¶17)	254 (2018) DLT 472
7.	<i>Kent RO Systems Ltd. and Ors. Vs. Amit Kotak and Ors.</i> (¶34)	2017(69) PTC 551(Del)
8.	<i>My Space Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd.</i> (¶¶77-78)	236 (2017) DLT 478
9.	<i>Swami Ramdev and Ors. vs. Facebook, Inc. and Ors.</i> (¶¶76-81,84)	263 (2019) DLT 689

f) Patent Act, 1970

S. No.	Title	Citation
a.	Objectives of Patent Law	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Monsanto Technology & ORS v. Nuziveedu Seeds & ORS</i> (¶¶23-24)	2014 SCC OnLine BAEPO 418
2.	<i>Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries</i> (¶¶ 17-19)	(1979) 2 SCC 511
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. v. Rajesh Bansal, Sole Proprietor, Manglam Technology</i> (¶¶10,12)	2018 SCC OnLine Del 9793
2.	<i>F Hoffman-la Roche v. Cipla Ltd</i> (¶¶14, 15, 67, 68)	2008 (37) PTC 71
3.	<i>Telemecanique & Controls (I) Ltd. v. Schneider Electric Industries SA</i> (¶¶ 21, 22)	2002 (24) PTC 632
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Bajaj Auto Ltd. v. TVS Motor Company Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 8, 9)	2008 (36) PTC 417 (Mad)
2.	<i>Shinning Industries v. Shri Krishna Industries</i> (¶¶ 7, 32, 33)	AIR 1975 All 231

b.	Invention/ Inventive Step	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Novartis AG v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 44-46)	2013 (4) PTC 1
2.	<i>Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries</i> (¶¶ 16, 17)	(1979) 2 SCC 511
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>F Hoffman-la Roche v. Cipla Ltd</i> (¶¶ 40, 41, 43)	2008 (37) PTC 71
2.	<i>Ram Narain Kher v. Ambassador Industries, New Delhi</i> (¶¶ 23, 24)	AIR 1976 Delhi 87
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Mariappan v. AR Safiullah</i> (¶¶ 18-20)	2008 (38) PTC 341 (Mad)
2.	<i>Dhanpat Seth v. Nil Kamal Plastic Crates Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 21, 27, 28)	2008 (36) PTC 123 (HP)
3.	<i>Press Metal Corporation Ltd. v. Noshir Sorabji Pochkhanwalla</i> (¶¶ 16, 18)	AIR 1983 Bom 144
4.	<i>Lallubhai Chakubhai Jariwala v. Samaldas Sankal Chand Shah</i> (¶¶ 29, 30, 31)	AIR 1934 Bom 407
c.	Non-Obviousness	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Novartis AG v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 183-184)	2013 (4) PTC 1
2.	<i>Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries</i> (¶¶ 19, 22)	(1979) 2 SCC 511
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Asian Electronics Ltd. v. Havells India Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 13-15)	2010 (44) PTC 66
2.	<i>F Hoffman-la Roche v. Cipla Ltd</i> (¶¶130-132)	2008 (37) PTC 71
3.	<i>Bilcare Ltd. v. Amartara Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 19, 20)	2007 (34) PTC 419
4.	<i>M/s Stanipack Private Ltd. v. M/s Oswal Trading Company Ltd.</i> (¶¶19-21)	AIR 2000 Delhi 23
5.	<i>Ram Narain Kher v. Ambassador Industries, New Delhi</i> (¶¶17, 23, 24)	AIR 1976 Delhi 87
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Bajaj Auto Ltd. v. TVS Motor Company Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 13-15)	2008 (36) PTC 417 (Mad)
2.	<i>Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Instacare Laboratories Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶10, 11)	2001 (21) PTC 472 (Guj)
d.	Rights of Patentee	
	High Court of Delhi	

1.	<i>Telefonaktiebolaget Lm Ericsson v. Intex Technologies (India)</i> (¶¶ 43-47)	2015 (62) PTC 90
2.	<i>F Hoffman-la Roche v. Cipla Ltd</i> (¶¶ 110, 111)	2008 (37) PTC 71
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Garware Wall Ropes Ltd. v. AI Chopra, Engineers & Contractors</i> (¶¶17, 18)	2010 (42) PTC 731 (Bom)
2.	<i>FDC Ltd. v. Sanjeev Khandelwal</i> (¶¶ 28, 29)	2007 (35) PTC 436 (Mad)
3.	<i>Dimminaco A.G. v. Controller of Patent and Designs</i> (¶¶10, 11)	2002 IPLR 255 (Cal)
e.	Filing & Surrender/ Revocation of Patent	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Monsanto Company v. Coramandal Indag Products Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 11, 12)	(1986) 1 SCC 642
2.	<i>Bishwanath Prasad Radhey Shyam v. Hindustan Metal Industries</i> (¶¶19, 20)	(1979) 2 SCC 511
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Communication Components Antenna Inc. vs. Ace Technologies Corp. and Ors.</i> (¶¶36-39,77-78)	MANU/DE/2202/2019
2.	<i>F Hoffman-la Roche v. Cipla Ltd., Mumbai Central, Mumbai</i> (¶¶ 115, 116)	2012 (52) PTC 1
3.	<i>Chemtura Corporation v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 13, 14)	2009 (41) PTC 260
4.	<i>Bilcare Ltd. v. Amartara Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 46, 48, 81, 84)	2007 (34) PTC 419
5.	<i>M/s Stanipack Private Ltd. v. M/s Oswal Trading Company Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 14, 15)	AIR 2000 Delhi 23
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Farbwerke Hoechst Aktiengesellschaft Vornals Meister Lucius & Bruning Corporation v. Unichem Laboratories</i> (¶¶16-18)	AIR 1969 Bom 255
2.	<i>Lallubhai Chakubhai Jariwala v. Samaldas Sankal Chand Shah</i> (¶¶ 34, 35)	AIR 1934 Bom 407
f.	Compulsory Licenses	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Bayer Corporation and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors</i> (¶¶ 117-119)	2019(78)PTC521(Del)
2.	<i>Bayer Corporation and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors.</i> (¶¶44-45)	238(2017)DLT701
3.	<i>Bayer Corporation and Anr. Vs Union of India) and Ors.</i> (¶¶33-34)	2010(43)PTC12(Del)
4.	<i>Bristol Myers Squibb Company v. J.D Joshi & Ors</i> (¶¶ 16, 17)	2015 (64) PTC 135
	Other Authorities	



	Intellectual Property Appellate Board	
1.	<i>Bayer Corporation v. Union of India, The Controller of Patents and Natco Pharma Ltd.</i> (¶¶16, 18)	MIPR 2013 (2) 97 (IPAB, Chennai)
	Controller of Patents	
1.	<i>Lee Pharma v. Astrazeneca</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	CLA No. 01 of 2015 DoD: January 19, 2016 (Controller of Patents, Mumbai)
g.	Infringement of Patent/ Remedies	
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Novartis AG v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 192, 193)	2013 (4) PTC 1
2.	<i>Anand Prasad Agarwalla v. Tarkeshwar Prasad</i> (¶¶ 4-6)	(2001) 5 SCC 568
3.	<i>Wander Ltd v. Antox India Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 10, 11)	1991 PTC 1
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Pradeep Sharma and Ors. vs. UPL Ltd. .</i> (¶8)	2019(77)PTC229(Del)
2.	<i>UPL Ltd. v. Pradeep Sharma and Ors.</i> (¶¶ 20-22)	MANU/DE/0772/2018
3.	<i>LG Electronics India Private Ltd. v. Bharat Bhogilal Patel</i> (¶¶ 88, 89)	2012 (51) PTC 513
4.	<i>Microsoft Corporation v. K. Mayuri</i> (¶¶ 14-16)	2007 (35) PTC 415
5.	<i>Bilcare Ltd. v. Amartara Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 19, 21, 89, 90)	2007 (34) PTC 419
6.	<i>National Research and Development Corporation of India v. Delhi Cloth and General Mills Co. Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 7-9)	AIR 1980 Del 132
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Hind Mosaic and Cement Works v. Shree Sahajanand Trading Corporation</i> (¶¶18, 25)	2008 (37) PTC 128 (Guj)
2.	<i>Bajaj Auto Ltd. v. TVS Motor Company Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 13-15)	2008 (36) PTC 417 (Mad)
3.	<i>FDC Ltd. v. Sanjeev Khandelwal</i> (¶¶ 6, 15, 22, 24, 26)	2007 (35) PTC 436 (Mad)
4.	<i>Wockhardt LTD. v. Hetero Drugs</i> (¶¶ 15-17)	2006 (32) PTC 65 (Mad)
5.	<i>Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd. v. Instacare Laboratories Private Ltd.</i> (¶10)	2001 (21) PTC 472 (Guj)
6.	<i>Fabcon v. Industrial Engineering Corporation</i> (¶¶ 36, 37)	AIR 1987 All 338
7.	<i>Laxmi Dutt Roop Chand v. Nankau</i> (¶¶ 26, 28, 29)	AIR 1964 All 27
h.	Standard Essential Patent	
	Foreign court	
1.	<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola Mobility, Inc and Gen. Instrument corp.</i> (¶A2) (Washington District Court)	104 U.S.P.Q.2D 2000

i.	Bolar Exemption	
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Bayer Corporation and Ors.v.Union of India and Ors.</i> (¶¶ 117-119)	2019(78)PTC521(Del)
2.	<i>Bayer Corporation and Ors.v.Union of India and Ors.</i> (¶¶44-45)	238(2017)DLT701
k.	Hot-tubbing	
1.	<i>Micromax Informatics Limitedv.Telefonaktiebolaget L.M. Ericsson</i> (¶¶13-14)	MANU/DE/1477/2019

g) Design Act, 2000

S. No.	Title	Citation
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Bharat Glass Tube v. Gopal Glass Works</i> (¶¶ 5, 6, 14)	2008 (37) PTC 1 (SC)
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Crocs Inc. USA vs. Bata India Ltd. and Ors.</i> (¶28)	2019 (78) PTC 1 (Del)
2.	<i>Pentel Kabushiki Kaisha and Ors. vs. Arora Stationers and Ors.</i> (¶25)	2019 (79) PTC 42 (Del)
3.	<i>Greenlight Planet India Pvt. Ltd. vs Gee Lighting Technology</i> (¶¶7-8)	MANU/DE/4203/2018
4.	<i>M/s Crocs Inc.USA v. M/s Liberty Shoes Ltd</i> (¶¶ 22, 24)	2018(73)PTC425(Del)
5.	<i>Kent RO Systems v. Amit Kotak</i> (¶¶ 28, 42, 44)	240 (2017) DLT 3
6.	<i>Carlsberg Breweries v. Som Distilleries and Breweries Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 177, 178)	2017 PTC 413
7.	<i>Reckitt Benkiser v. Wyeth Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 3, 7, 22)	2013 PTC 90
8.	<i>Dabur India Ltd. v. Amit Jain</i> (¶¶ 17, 18)	155 (2008) DLT 407
9.	<i>Glaxo Smithkline Consumer Healthcare GmbH v. Anchor Health</i> (¶¶ 15, 17)	2004 PTC 72
10.	<i>Smithkline Beechem v. Hindustan Liver</i> (¶¶ 13, 16)	2000 (28) PTC 83
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Cello Household Products v. Modware India</i> (¶¶ 12, 37, 38)	AIR 2017 Bom 162
2.	<i>Whirlpool of India v. Videocon Industries</i> (¶¶ 14, 17)	2014 (60) PTC 155 (Bom)
3.	<i>Marico v. Raj Oil Mills</i> (¶¶ 17, 28, 29)	2008 (37) PTC 109 (Bom)
4.	<i>Castrol India Ltd. v. Tide Water Oil Co. (I) Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 21, 22)	1996 (16) PTC 202 (Cal)

h) Trade Secrets

S. No.	Title	Citation
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>American Express Bank Ltd. v. Ms. Priya Puri</i> (¶¶ 6, 20, 46, 47)	(2006) III LLJ 540
2.	<i>Michael Heath Nathan Johnson v. Subhash Chandra</i> (¶¶ 34, 44, 47)	60 (1995) DLT 757
3.	<i>Mr. Anil Gupta v. Mr. Kunal Dasgupta</i> (¶¶ 104, 105)	(2002) ILR 1Delhi 250
4.	<i>John Richard Brady v. Chemical Process Equipments Private Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 38, 39)	AIR 1987 Delhi 372
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Homag India Private Ltd. v. Ulfath Ali Khan</i> (¶¶ 6, 40, 51)	MANU/KA/1569/2012
2.	<i>Jet Airways v. Mr. Jan Peter</i> (¶¶ 15, 19, 21)	2000 (4) ALL MR 437
3.	<i>Tractors and Farm Equipment Ltd. v. Green Field Farm Equipments Pvt. Ltd. and Ors</i> (¶¶ 24, 25, 28)	2006 (32) PTC 343(Mad)

i) Geographical Indications of Goods (Registration & Protection) Act, 1999

S. No.	Title	Citation
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>State Government Of Madhya Pradesh v. Union Of India & Ors</i> (¶¶ 39-44)	MANU/DE/1444/2019
2.	<i>Scotch Whisky Association v. Golden Bottling Limited</i> (¶¶ 16-18)	2006 (32) PTC 656
3.	<i>Dyer Meakin Breweries v. Scotch Whisky Association</i> (¶¶ 16, 17)	AIR 1980 Del 125
4.	<i>Mohan Meakin v. Scotch Whisky</i> (¶¶ 15, 17)	17 (1980) DLT 466
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Tea Board of India v. ITC Ltd</i> (¶¶ 6, 19, 20)	2019(79)PTC 1(C al)
2.	<i>Scotch Whiskey Association v. Pravara Shakar Karkhana</i> (¶¶ 30, 31)	AIR 1992 Bom. 294
3.	<i>Imperial Tobacco v. Registrar of Trademarks</i> (¶¶ 8, 25, 39)	AIR 1977 Cal 413

j) Biological Diversity Act, 2002

S. No.	Title	Citation
	Supreme Court	

1.	<i>Aruna Rodrigues and Ors v. Union of India</i> (¶¶ 5, 6)	(2012) 5 SCC 331
	Other High Courts	
1.	<i>Central India AYUSH Drug Manufacturers' Association v. State of Maharashtra</i> (¶¶ 27, 28)	AIR 2016 Bom 261
2.	<i>R. Muralidharan v. The Secretary Ministry of Law & Justice</i> (¶¶ 1, 17, 18)	2015-2-LW481 (Mad)
3.	<i>Environment Support Group v. National Biodiversity Authority</i> (¶ 3)	AIR 2014 Kant 20
	National Green Tribunal	
1.	<i>Bio Diversity Management Committee v. Western Coalfields Ltd.</i> (¶¶ 29, 30, 31, 33)	OA Nos. 28/2013; 17/2014 (CZ) DoD: October 06, 2015

k) Plant Variety Protection and Farmers' Rights Act, 2001

S. No	Title	Citation
	Supreme Court	
1.	<i>Monsanto Technology LLC and Ors. vs. Nuziveedu Seeds Ltd. and Ors.</i> (¶23)	AIR 2019 SC 559
	High Court of Delhi	
1.	<i>Pioneer Overseas Corporation vs. Chairperson, Protection of Plant Varieties and Farmers Rights and Ors.</i> (¶72)	MANU/DE/2102/2019
2.	<i>Prabhat Agri Biotech Ltd. and Ors. Vs Registrar of Plant Varieties and Ors.</i> .(¶40)	MIPR 2017 (1) 349

F. General Readings

John Doe/ Ashok Kumar & Anton Piller Orders			
1.	Copyright Enforcement: Evaluating The Hardships Caused By 'ANTON PILLER' & 'JOHN DOE' orders in India	Nitish R Daniel	Journal OF Legal Studies and Research Volume 4 Issue 3 June 2018
2.	Anton Piller Order in UK and its Possible Implications in India	Souvik Bhadra and Arka Majumdar	Journal of Intellectual Property Rights Vol 12, September 2007, pp 488-496

1. Practice Directions by HMJ Pratibha M. Singh

S.No.	Suit Title	Suit No.	Date of Decision	Direction(s)
1.	<i>Amrish Agarwal v. Venus Home Appliances Pvt. Ltd.</i>	CM(M) 1059/18	27.08.19	The TC's order, taking on record the Legal Proceedings Certificate relating to the trademark, was challenged on the ground that evidence had already concluded and the matter was at the stage of final arguments. The Court observed that in a trademark infringement matter, it is imperative for the Court to be able to see that the trademark itself is registered. <u>Directions were therefore passed, specifying the documents, such as the Legal Proceedings Certificate, which ought to be filed along with the plaint in trade mark infringement matters.</u> (Para 7)
2.	<i>Lalit Kumar v. M/s Samsonite IP Holding SARL</i>	CM(M) 737/19	29.08.19	The TC's order, appointing an LC to seize the alleged counterfeit products, was challenged on the ground that the name of Defendant No. 2 was mentioned as 'Ashok Kumar'. The reason given for not specifying the name of the Defendant was that the Plaintiff was unaware of the name of the Defendant's proprietor. In order to ensure that such grievances are not raised in the future, <u>a direction was given that if the name of the proprietor of the Defendant or any other entity is not known, the trading name shall appear in the memo of parties as the name of the Defendant.</u> (Para 7)
3.	<i>Satender Singh Rana & Ors. v. Gaon Sabha Kadipur & Anr.</i>	CM(M) 1017/19	29.08.19	In view of the fact that several adjournments were taking place due to non-receipt or non-supply of copies of complete pleadings and documents, <u>directions were passed in respect of service of copies of documents/pleadings between counsels and court clerks.</u> (Para 3)
4.	<i>BVG India Ltd. v. Navin Saini</i>	CM(M) 1311/19	04.09.19	In this case, a handwritten notation had caused confusion as to whether only the dispute in the suit was settled or whether all the disputes arising

				<p>under the agreements between the parties were settled. <u>It was observed that the court which recorded the settlement ought to have perused the report and clarified the same prior to disposing of the suit. Direction was given to Mediators to not allow any handwritten notations or words, in the Mediation/settlement agreements, especially if the same are not countersigned/initialed by the Mediator himself.</u> (Para's 6&7)</p>
5.	<i>PSA Nitrogen Ltd. v. Maeda Corporation</i>	CM(M) 4/19	17.09.19	<p>The TC's order, rejecting the Plaintiff's application for condonation of delay in filing the written statement to the Defendant's counterclaim, was challenged on the ground that the counter-claim had not been registered. The Court clarified that a counter-claim is governed by the same rules as applicable to plaints under the Commercial Courts Act. Hence, it was observed that every counter-claim must be registered before summons can be issued and the time for filing the written statement runs from the date of service of summons. <u>Directions were given prescribing the procedure to be followed for registration of counter-claims to ensure that there is no ambiguity in the timelines for filing of the written statement to the counter-claim.</u> (Para 11)</p>
6.	<i>Rajesh Aggarwal v. Om Prakash & Anr.</i>	CM(M) 768/19	17.09.19	<p>The TC's order, permitting an amendment to the plaint, was challenged on the ground that it was highly belated. The Court <u>observed that at the stage of final arguments the TC ought not to permit amendments in the plaint.</u> (Para's 4&5)</p>
7.	<i>M/s Prakash Oil Corporation & Anr. v. BrijKishan</i>	CM (M) 1002/18	19.09.19	<p>The question before the Court was whether the admissibility and mode of proof of an exhibited document is to be decided at the final stage or during the trial itself - at the time when the exhibit mark is being put on the document. The Court observed that the mere marking of a document as an exhibit does not amount to it being proved. Several judgments were relied on to <u>clarify the procedure to be adopted in the case of exhibition of documents. Finally, it was</u></p>

				<p>observed that <u>“allowing objections regarding exhibited documents to be captured in the statement of the witness and permitting cross examination to be conducted without prejudice to the objections raised, would strike the right balance between ensuring that the trial is not protracted and that the rights of the party are also not jeopardized”</u>. (Para’s 10-14)</p>
8.	<i>Veena Gupta v. Bajaj Allianz Life Insurance Co. Ltd.</i>	CM (M) 1555/19	30.10.19	<p>The TC’s order, imposing costs on the Plaintiff for non-appearance, was challenged on the ground that the Junior Counsel’s appearance had wrongly been recorded as ‘Proxy Counsel’, due to which the Plaintiff was considered as having not appeared. <u>The Court issued directions clarifying when the term “Proxy Counsel” ought to be used.</u>(Para 6)</p>
9.	<i>Zile Singh v. Santosh@Santra & Ors.</i>	CM (M) 1296/18	06.11.19	<p>This petition challenged an order of the TC by which the evidence of a witness was directed to not be read, as no affidavit had been filed on their behalf and the evidence of another witness, who was present in Court, was not recorded, on the ground that the list of witnesses was not filed. In so far as the second witness was concerned, the Court held that <u>“once witnesses are summoned and are present before the Court, with notice to the opposite party, the usual procedure ought to be to record their evidence rather than sending them back”</u>. As regards the first witness, it was found that a <u>non-existent affidavit had been exhibited</u>. In view of these discrepancies in the recording of evidence, <u>directions were passed, specifying the manner in which evidence must be recorded</u>. (Para 14)</p>
10.	<i>Ganga Ram v. Shekhar Kumar</i>	CM (M) 1656/19	22.11.19	<p>Two grievances were raised in this petition. The first was that the TC had accepted the Plaintiff’s witness’ evidence by way of affidavit without the Plaintiff having filed a list of witnesses. The second was in relation to the de-exhibition of exhibited documents. With respect to the first grievance, while an exception was made in this case, it was observed that <u>parties ought not to be permitted to commence evidence without having</u></p>

				<p><u>filed a list of witnesses. As regards the second grievance, it was observed that <u>the mere exhibition of a document does not amount to it being proved.</u> (Para's 5-8)</u></p>
11.	<i>Harwant Singh v. Govind Singh</i>	CM(M) 1662/19	22.11.19	<p>In this case, the written statement was taken on record, subject to costs. A demand draft was made out in the name of the Plaintiff, however, the same was not accepted on the ground that the costs were to be tendered in the name of the Plaintiff's counsel. On the Plaintiff's claim that costs had not been tendered, the written statement was taken off the record and additional costs were imposed on the Plaintiff. Setting aside this order, the Court held that - "<u>Whenever orders are passed imposing costs on parties, unless there is any specific person in whose favour the costs are directed to be paid, it is understood that costs are to be in the name of the party in whose favour the costs are being awarded.</u>"(Para 5)</p>
12.	<i>Krishan Kumar v. Shanti Devi & Anr.</i>	CM(M) 1694/19	29.11.19	<p>The grievance in this petition was that the TC had settled the issues and also directed affidavits-in-evidence to be filed, without waiting for the Plaintiff's to file their replication. After passing certain directions, specific to the case at hand, the Court observed that - "<u>In order to avoid unnecessary delays and complexities, by framing issues prior to filing of replication, it is directed that in future, Trial Courts shall ensure that if permission for replication is being granted, issues shall be framed only after the replication is filed.</u>"(Para 4)</p>
13.	<i>Sarvesh Bisaria v. Anand NirogDham Hospital Pvt. Ltd.</i>	CM (M) 1787/19	17.12.19	<p>In this case, though the suit had been filed under Order XXXVII CPC, summons were not issued under the said order. Instead, a template order had been passed which simply set out various portions of the CPC, did not record any satisfaction under Order XXXVII CPC and required the Defendant to file his written statement within 30 days of the receipt of summons. It was held that - "<u>Whenever summons are issued, the Court has to be conscious of the provision under which the</u></p>

				<p><i>summons is to be issued. The summons in a summary suit is completely different from the summons in Form No.2, for settlement of issues in an ordinary suit. Clearly, the Court has not taken into consideration that the suit was filed under Order XXXVII CPC and the Plaintiff's grievance is thus completely justified.</i>"(Para 10)</p>
14.	<p><i>ICICI v. Naveen Kalkal; ICICI v. Priya Baveja;</i></p> <p><i>ICICI v. Deepanshu Bansal & Anr.</i></p> <p><i>&</i></p> <p><i>Connected Matters</i></p>	<p>CM (M) 1821/2019; CM (M) 16/2020;</p> <p>CM (M) 18/2020</p>	<p>23.12.19 ;</p> <p>13.01.20 20;</p> <p>13.01.20 20</p>	<p>These petitions concerned applications seeking permission to sell hypothecated vehicles. In all these cases, though possession of the vehicle had been taken by the Receiver, inordinate delay was being caused in the grant of permission for sale of the vehicle, leading to additional expenditure for maintenance etc. In view of this, as well as the fact that the value of the vehicle deteriorates as time passes by, the Court directed the TC to expeditiously consider such applications. The <u>directions, as to the manner in which cases of vehicle loans are to be dealt with, as passed by a</u> Id. Single Judge of the Delhi High Court in <i>M/s. ICICI Bank Ltd. v. Kamal Kumar Garewal, [FAO 49/2015, decided on 29th May, 2015]</i>, were reiterated and public auction was permitted in all the cases.</p> <p>(<u>Naveen Kalkal</u>: Para's 6-9; <u>Priya Baveja</u>: Para's 9-12; <u>Deepanshu Bansal</u>: Para's 5-8)</p>
15.	<p><i>YN Gupta (Deceased thr. LRs) v. MA Ramzana</i></p>	<p>CM (M) 1827/19</p>	<p>24.12.19</p>	<p>In this case, the matter had been heard and adjourned on more than 10 hearings, with the order-sheet showing the matter as being either 'part-heard' or listed 'for orders'. The Court <u>held that it was impermissible to repeatedly adjourn cases for orders</u> and observed that the same "<u>reflects extremely poorly on the Court system</u>" and that "<u>Repeated hearing of arguments also increases the litigation costs for litigants, as they have to incur expenses for legal representation, etc., Such a practice would also make access to justice unaffordable.</u>"(Para's 18-20)</p>

DISCLAIMER: All Articles suggested hereinabove contain/reflect the views of the concerned author(s) only.