



\$~49

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

+ **CS(COMM) 382/2023 & I.A. 16023/2025**

ASHIRVAD PIPES PRIVATE LIMITEDPlaintiff

Through: Mr. Prashant Gupta, Adv. (through
vc)

versus

**VISHAL KUMAR SINGH TRADING AS MS VISHAL
ELECTRICALS**Defendant

Through: Ms. Rajni Singh (in person)
Ms. Geetika Antil, Adv. (through vc)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **23.12.2025**

1. This is a suit for restraining infringement, passing off, unfair trade practices, dilution, and for seeking damages under Sections 27, 29, and 135 of the Trademarks Act, 1999.

2. The plaintiff is a company engaged in the business of manufacturing



and selling pipes under the trade name AHIRVAD/

['subject mark'] since 1975.

3. The defendant was engaged in the business of selling water pumps, and has applied for the registration of the mark



['impugned mark'] under application no. 5766525

dated 16.01.2023 in class 7, which is pending consideration. The defendant



has commenced the manufacturing of products under the impugned mark which is deceptively similar to the subject mark.

4. The plaintiff, being aggrieved by the defendant's infringing acts, has thus instituted the present suit.

Permanent Injunction

5. Ms. Rajni Singh is present in Court. Ms. Geetika Antil, Advocate on behalf of the defendant, has joined the proceedings through video conferencing and identifies Ms. Singh. Ms. Singh has been regularly representing the defendant in this suit.

5.1. Learned counsel and Ms. Singh states that the relief for permanent injunction in terms of the relief sought in paragraph 39(i), (ii), and (iii) of the plaint may be passed against the defendant as the defendant is not contesting the claims of the plaintiff in the subject mark.

6. In view of the aforesaid no contest, the relief for permanent injunction as prayed for at paragraph 39 (i), (ii), and (iii) is hereby passed in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant.

Legal Costs

7. Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that the plaintiff would be satisfied if legal costs are awarded in favour of the plaintiff. The statement of costs amounting to Rs. 13,42,050/- has been placed on record.

8. In response, the defendant states that it can pay legal costs up to Rs. 2 lakhs in a reasonable period of time. It is stated that defendant has limited financial means.

9. In response, learned counsel for the plaintiff states that legal costs be awarded as per discretion of the Court.

10. Having considered the submissions of the parties, legal costs to the



extent of Rs. 2 lakhs are hereby awarded in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant. The defendant is granted eight [8] weeks' time to pay these costs to the plaintiff failing which it will be liable to pay interest at 15% per annum on the said costs.

11. The remaining reliefs are disposed of as not pressed.

12. The registry is directed to draw up a decree in terms thereof.

13. Accordingly, the suit stands disposed of. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

14. All future dates stand cancelled.

15. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of the order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

DECEMBER 23, 2025/msh/aa