



\$~11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CS(COMM) 193/2022 & I.A. 20006/2023**

LIVING MEDIA INDIA LIMITED & ANR. Plaintiffs

Through: **Mr. Hrishikesh Baruah, Mr. Anurag
Mishra and Mr. Kumar Kshitij, Advs.**

versus

AABTAK CHANNEL.COM (JOHN DOES) & ORS..... Defendants

Through: **Ms. Shweta Sahu and Mr. Parva
Khare, Advs. for D-2.
Mr. Kartik Rai, Adv. for D-15 to 19.
Ms. Mamta Jha, Mr. Rohan Ahuja,
Ms. Shruttima Ehersa and Ms. Diya
Viswanath, Advs. for D-31.
Mr. Deepak Gogia and Mr. Aadhar
Nautiyal, Advs. for D-33.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

21.03.2024

%

1. Mr. Kartik Rai, Counsel for defendant Nos.15 to 19 appears and states that they have no objection if a decree is passed in terms of judgment dated 06th September, 2023 passed by this Court previously. As per the said judgment, decree was passed in favour of the plaintiffs with respect to defendant Nos.1 to 14 and defendant Nos.20 to 30. The said decree was passed in the following terms:

“14. There shall, therefore, be a decree of permanent injunction, restraining Defendants 1 to 14 and 20 to 30 from using any of the marks noted alongside the said Defendants in the table in para 2 supra, or any other mark which is confusingly or deceptively similar to the mark



“AAJ TAK”/ of the plaintiffs, either as a word mark or as a logo, or any other mark which is confusingly similar to the plaintiff’s marks, for running any online channel or for any other goods or services which may be regarded as allied or cognate thereto.”

2. Accordingly, a decree in favour of the plaintiffs and against defendant Nos.15 to 19 is passed in the following terms:

“There shall, therefore, be a decree of permanent injunction, restraining Defendants 15 to 19 from using any of the marks noted alongside the said Defendants in the table in para 2 supra, or any other mark which is confusingly or deceptively similar to the mark “AAJ



TAK”/ of the plaintiffs, either as a word mark or as a logo, or any other mark which is confusingly similar to the plaintiff’s marks, for running any online channel or for any other goods or services which may be regarded as allied or cognate thereto.”

3. Decree-sheet be drawn up accordingly. Damages and costs are not pressed by the counsel for the plaintiffs as regards defendant Nos.15 to 19.
4. Accordingly, the suit is disposed of since decree against all the contesting defendants has already been passed.
5. The other defendants, namely, defendant Nos.31 to 33 are social media platforms and defendant Nos.34 to 36 are domain name registrars. Defendant No.37 is John Doe. Compliances by the said defendants have already been made previously in the suit and the plaintiffs do not press any further relief against them.
6. Suit is disposed of with abovesaid terms. Pending applications, if any,



also stand disposed of.

7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MARCH 21, 2024/MK/ig