



Serial No. 18
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C) No. 105 of 2024

Date of Decision: 08.10.2025

M/s Allied Blenders and Distillers Limited,

Formerly known as Allied Blenders and Distillers Private Limited,
Having its registered office at 394-C, Lamington Chambers,
Lamington Road, Mumbai-400004

Versus

1. State of Meghalaya represented by the
Principal Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya,
Excise, Registration, Taxation and Stamps Department,
Shillong, Meghalaya.
2. Meghalaya Board of Revenue,
Shillong, Meghalaya
3. The Commissioner of Excise, Meghalaya
Shillong, Meghalaya.
4. Tilaknagar Industries Limited,
Through its Managing Director,
Industrial Assurance Building,
3rd Floor, Churchgate, Mumbai-400 020

..... Respondent(s)



Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. S. Sen, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mrs. T. Yangi B, AAG with
Ms. Z.E. Nongkynrih, GA (For R 1-3
Mr. K. Paul, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. S. Chanda, Adv. (For R 4)

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in
Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication
in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Mr. S. Sen, learned counsel for the petitioner prays that he may be allowed to withdraw the instant application, however with a liberty to file afresh, if so advised.

2. Mr. K. Paul, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr. S. Chanda, learned counsel for the respondent No. 4, though not objecting to the withdrawal, however has raised serious objections with regard to the prayer for liberty to file afresh. The learned Senior counsel has



submitted that the order of the Bombay High Court passed in the injunction matter dated 16.07.2025, has clearly ordered that both the petitioner and the respondent shall continue the current status of non-introduction of their products in India under the impugned marks MANSION HOUSE and SAVOY CLUB, till decision of the Suit. He further submits that the matter was then carried to the Supreme Court, wherein the order of the Division Bench was upheld. He therefore, contends that any liberty that may be granted will run against the order passed by the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court as well as the order of the Supreme Court.

3. Mr. S. Sen, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a fact that the injunction order has been passed, wherein directions as submitted by the learned Senior counsel are in operation. However, he submits that as the Suit has been directed to be disposed of within 6(six) months, by the Supreme Court, in the event that a fresh cause of action arises thereafter, the petitioner may be given a liberty to seek appropriate legal remedy.

4. Having considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and on examination of the order passed by the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court in the injunction matter and of the



Supreme Court in the Special Leave Petition, the withdrawal of the writ petition is allowed with the liberty granted, only if a fresh cause of action arises in the event the petitioner is still aggrieved after the Suit has been disposed of.

5. The matter stands closed and is accordingly disposed of.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
08.10.2025
"V. Lyndem-PS"