



\$~53

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

+ **CS(COMM) 466/2024**

SINGH AND SINGH LAW FIRM LLP & ANR.Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Kunal Tandon, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Vivek Ranjan, Mr. Krishnagopal Abhay, Mr. Sahib Singh Dhillon, Mr. Rinku, Mr. Sarath J. Prakash, Ms. Pari Bharwaj, Ms. Natasha and Ms. Shreni Taran, Advs.

versus

SINGH AND SINGH ATTORNEYS & ORS.Defendants

Through: Ms. Ameer Rana, Ms. Sana Banyal and Mr. Mrityunjay Roy, Advs. for D-4
Mr. Saurabh Kumar (through vc) and Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advs. for D-5
Ms. Aishwarya Kane, Adv. for D-6

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% 17.12.2025

I.A. 31612/2025 (for modification of order dated 09.12.2025)

1. This is an application filed by the plaintiffs under Section 152 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, ['CPC'], seeking clarification of the order dated 09.12.2025.
2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiffs states on instructions that the Plaintiffs are only pressing for a decree in terms of the relief sought at paragraph '70(a)' of the plaint.
3. He states that the Plaintiffs are not pressing the relief sought in



paragraph '70(b)' of the plaint, although the same has been sought in the prayer of the captioned application.

4. He further states that with respect to the relief sought in paragraph '70(c)' of the plaint, which was pressed for at the hearing dated 09.12.2025, the Plaintiffs seek leave to avail their remedies vis-à-vis this relief and seek liberty to withdraw the said relief in accordance with law.

5. He states that, therefore, the suit may be decreed against the infringing Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 alone in terms of relief sought in paragraph '70(a)' of the plaint. The statement of the Plaintiffs is taken on record.

6. It is noted that the Plaintiffs are now pressing for their reliefs in these proceedings against Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 only qua the relief sought in paragraph '70(a)' of the plaint, which reads as under:

“a. Pass a decree of permanent injunction restraining the Defendant Nos. 1 and 2, their partners/ promoters, associates, family members, employees and any one acting for and on their behalf for using the impugned marks including the mark(s) / name(s) / logo(s) “Singh and Singh”, “Singh & Singh”, “singhlaw”, “singhandsingh”, www.singhlaw.co.za, the S&S Logo, “Singh and Singh Attorneys”, or any other trademark/ trade name/ service name/ trading style or domain name, Facebook profile, twitter handle, LinkedIN profile, advertisements, social media promotions, logo or device, etc. which is either identical to or deceptively similar to the Plaintiffs’ mark(s) / name(s) / logo(s) Singh & Singh, Singh & Singh Law Firm LLP, Singh and Singh, Singh & Singh.com, singhlaw, singhandsingh.com, Singh & Singh Advocates, Singh & Singh Attorneys or any other derivatives thereof so as to result in infringement of trade mark(s), passing off, acts of unfair competition, dilution, etc. at any place or in any form including in print or electronic media, online platform, etc.,”

7. The application is disposed of, taking on record the aforesaid submissions.



CS(COMM) 466/2024

8. This suit has been filed seeking a permanent injunction restraining the infringement of the registered trademark, passing off, dilution, damages, and other ancillary reliefs.

Factual Matrix as set up in the plaint

9. The Plaintiffs' name 'Singh & Singh' was coined in 1997, and has been extensively used since then. The Plaintiffs are a law firm practising in Constitutional, Commercial, Intellectual Property laws, etc.

9.1. The Plaintiffs' earliest trademark registration is for the device mark

Singh & Singh
Advocates

bearing TM no. 1408313 in class 42, application dated 22.12.20005. Thereafter, the Plaintiffs also secured registration of the

SINGH&SINGH

device mark bearing TM no. 1860364, application dated 09.09.2009 in class 42['Plaintiffs' trademarks'].

9.2. The Plaintiffs have acquired goodwill and reputation in India and in several foreign countries. The Plaintiffs have a clientele to whom it has rendered its services from several countries apart from India.

9.3. The Plaintiffs' various accolades have been set out in paragraph '24' of the plaint.

Recognition of Plaintiffs' proprietary rights

10. In June 2023, the Plaintiffs initiated a Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy [UDRP] complaint before World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO] against the registrant of the domain www.singhandsingh.org. The three-member panel held that the domain



name was identical to the Plaintiffs' trademark 'Singh & Singh', that the respondent had no rights or legitimate interest, and that the domain was registered and used in bad faith. Consequently, the panel ordered the transfer of the domain to the Plaintiffs.

11. The name 'Singh & Singh' has been consistently protected by this Court on multiple occasions:

11.1. In May 2022, the Court granted an interim injunction against a US-based law firm that started its practice using the name 'Singh and Singh' in Canada, holding that such use would cause significant confusion and amounted to an attempt to ride on the Plaintiffs' goodwill and reputation.

11.2. In June 2021, the Court similarly granted an interim injunction against a Canadian law firm using the name 'Singh + Singh', rejecting objections to jurisdiction and recognising the Plaintiffs' international and transborder reputation. The Court held that identical marks used for identical services would inevitably cause confusion among clients worldwide.

12. Therefore, the Plaintiffs' mark has acquired popularity and goodwill in the legal fraternity amongst the clients in India as well as internationally.

Overview of the Defendants

13. Defendant No.1/Singh and Singh Attorneys ['impugned mark'] is a company located in South Africa, and claims to be a Professional Property Specialist [PPS] and provides conveyancing services to its clients.

13.1. Defendant No.2/Ms. Indira Singh is the owner and founder of Defendant No.1 [collectively referred to as 'the infringing Defendants' hereinafter].

13.2. Defendant No.3/Xneelo is the Registrar of Defendant No.1's website/domain www.singhlaw.co.za ['impugned website/domain'].



13.3. Defendant No.4/Facebook and Defendant No.5/LinkedIn are social media platforms wherein the infringing Defendants have created handles and pages using the impugned mark.

13.4. Defendant No.6/Google LLC, wherein the infringing Defendants are advertising their services.

13.5. Defendant Nos. 4, 5, and 6 are hereinafter referred to as the proforma Defendants.

Defendants' Infringement

13.6. The Plaintiffs in March 2024 learnt that Defendant No.1/Singh and Singh Attorneys was using the name 'Singh and Singh' on its impugned website/domain.

13.7. It is stated that Defendant No.1's domain name singhlaw.co.za, and Plaintiffs' Facebook page at @SinghLawFirmLLP are deceptively similar. The said Facebook page was created on 05.01.2018, whereas the impugned website/domain was registered in Defendant No.1's name on 15.10.2021.

13.8. The infringing Defendants are actively promoting the impugned mark on social media platforms, such as Facebook and LinkedIn, in addition to their impugned website/domain. Such promotion is likely to reach clients of Indian origin, whether residing in India or abroad, who are liable to be misled into believing that the infringing Defendants are connected, associated, or otherwise related to the Plaintiffs, thereby causing confusion as to the source, affiliation, and origin of the Defendants' services

Court's Findings

14. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

15. The predecessor bench of this Court vide order dated 29.05.2024 had



issued summons and granted an ex-parte ad interim injunction in favour of the Plaintiffs, and restrained the infringing Defendants from using the Plaintiffs' trademark in any manner whatsoever. The operative part of the order reads as follows: -

27. Till the next date of hearing, Defendants No. 1 and 2 or anybody acting on their behalf are restrained from using in India the impugned marks "Singh and Singh," "Singh & Singh,"

"singhlaw," "singhandsingh," ",



" or any other trademark/ trade name/ service name/ trading style, which is either identical to, or deceptively similar to Plaintiffs' marks/ names/ logos "Singh & Singh," "Singh & Singh Law Firm LLP", "Singh and Singh," "http://www.singhandsingh.com/," "singhlaw," "singhandsingh.com," "Singh & Singh Advocates," "Singh & Singh Attorneys" or any other derivatives thereof so as to result in infringement and passing off of Plaintiffs' trademarks.

28. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India and Department of Telecommunications, Ministry of Communications, Government of India is directed to issue necessary directions to the telecom service providers and internet service providers to block access within India to the website hosted on the impugned domain name "https://singhlaw.co.za/".

16. The learned Joint Registrar (J) vide order dated 17.12.2024 has recorded that despite service, no written statement has been filed on behalf of the infringing Defendants, and eventually their right to file written statement was closed.

17. It is a matter of record that the Defendant Nos. 1, 2, and 3 have been proceeded ex parte vide order dated 09.12.2025.



18. In these facts, this Court finds it apposite to produce the comparison of the marks of the Plaintiffs and the infringing Defendants, which is as follows: -

Comparison table - names, domains, social media accounts and primary logos			
S. No.	Description	Plaintiffs	Primary Defendants
1.	Mark/name	Singh & Singh	Singh and Singh
2.	Full name	Singh & Singh Law Firm I.P	Singh and Singh Attorneys
3.	Abbreviated name	Singh & Singh Law Firm	Singh and Singh
4.	Domain name/ website	http://www.singhandsingh.com/	https://singhlaw.co.za/
5.	Facebook	@SinghLawFirmLLP	@Singh & Singh Attorneys and Conveyancers
6.	LOGO (trade name)	SINGH & SINGH	Singh and Singh
7.	LOGO		

19. On a bare comparison of the Plaintiffs' mark 'Singh & Singh' and the infringing Defendants' impugned mark 'Singh and Singh', it is evident that the said Defendants have adopted a mark which is virtually identical to the Plaintiffs' mark with the intention to mislead consumers into believing that the impugned mark on the impugned website/domain and social media



platforms originate from or are associated with the Plaintiffs, thereby riding upon the goodwill and proprietary rights of the Plaintiffs.

20. The Plaintiffs have pleaded in the plaint that their mark has acquired trans-boundary reputation and that the infringing Defendant's use of the impugned mark for identical services constitutes infringement, passing off, and dilution. The relevant paragraphs read as follows: -

“51. The impugned marks are being used by the Primary Defendants (i.e. Defendant Nos. 1 and 2) on their website and social media, including Facebook and LinkedIn, which are clearly visible and accessible in India through interactive web pages.

52. The adoption of the impugned marks by the Primary Defendants is deliberate, malafide and with the intention of encashing upon the enormous reputation and goodwill that the mark / name Singh & Singh / Singh and Singh enjoys and carries in India and abroad. They would have been well-aware of the established name and reputation of Singh & Singh which they now seek to encash. The imitation of the mark / name points towards malafide adoption. The misrepresentation is writ large as it is in the course of rendering legal services to the same set of clientele and law firms who are well-aware of the established reputation of Singh & Singh for more than two decades. The Plaintiffs website www.singhandsingh.com with the .com is the most commonly used domain name for any purpose.

53. The manner in which legal services are rendered across the globe being on the basis of word of mouth, reputation, name, quality of services and with information on the internet etc. coupled with the familiarity of foreign clients/law firms that the Plaintiff No. 1's name, Singh & Singh would clearly lead them to believe that the Defendant No. 1 Singh and Singh Attorneys is another branch or an associate office of the Plaintiff No.1 Singh & Singh. The confusion would be of affiliation, sponsorship and/or some connection. This would result in not merely passing off but also enormous damage to the Plaintiffs inasmuch as associates and clients are bound to get confused with the use of the impugned name/mark.

54. It is submitted that in light of the goodwill and cross-border



reputation of the Plaintiff No. 1 firm with strong presence on social media and the website www.singhandsingh.com which entails in international recognition and transborder reputation, the adoption of the Singh & Singh mark by the Primary Defendants cannot be disregarded as coincidence or honest adoption by any stretch of imagination. In this age of immediate access to information over the internet, the said Defendants have obviously been aware of the Plaintiff No. 1 firm through its website www.singhandsingh.com which is the first result on Google when a user searches for “Singh & Singh”. By adopting and advertising under the said name, the intention of Primary Defendants is obviously to garner clients and work on the strength and reputation (including crossborder reputation) of the Singh & Singh name vested in the Plaintiffs. This is a complete misrepresentation and misleading in nature. The Primary Defendants mark/name is phonetically identical to the Plaintiffs’ mark/name. 55. The acts of the Primary Defendants are also unfair as the Defendants while being aware about the use of the registered marks Singh & Singh in India and internationally by the Plaintiffs have malafidely adopted the impugned mark despite being legal professionals themselves. Their direct and indirect association with Singh & Singh due to the use of an identical mark / name / logo leaves no doubt that the adoption is with a view to cause damage to the Plaintiffs and wrongfully gain from the use of the impugned name / mark / logo.”

[emphasis supplied]

21. The Courts and arbitral panels have, on various occasions, acknowledged the Plaintiffs’ transborder reputation. In this regard, this Court deems it apposite to rely on the order by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Singh & Singh Law Firm LLP & Anr. V. Singh & Sigh PLLC & Ors.**¹ The relevant paragraphs read as follows: -

“35. Having heard learned Senior counsel for the Plaintiffs, this Court is of the prima facie opinion that the use of the marks “Singh & Singh”, “Singh & Singh Law”, “Singh & Singh Law PLLC”, “Singh & Singh Law, PLLC”, which are identical or deceptively similar to the trademarks of the Plaintiffs is likely to cause

¹ CS(COMM) 300/2022



confusion to the clients, both in India and abroad, as Plaintiff No.1 is stated to have significant and extensive digital presence. The Court is also of the prima facie opinion that the adoption of the identical name by Defendants No.1 to 3 is not bona fide and is with a view to ride over the formidable goodwill and reputation of the Plaintiffs. Learned Senior Counsel is right in his contention that confusion amongst the clients can have undesirable ramifications for the Plaintiffs in case injunction is not granted.”

[emphasis supplied]

22. Additionally, since the infringing Defendants have failed to take any requisite steps to contest the present suit and file their written statements despite having been afforded sufficient opportunities and being bound by the ex-parte ad-interim injunction dated 29.05.2024, their conduct demonstrates a clear lack of intent to defend the present proceedings.

23. At this stage, it would be apposite to refer to Order VIII Rule 10 of CPC. The said rule reads as under: -

“10. Procedure when party fails to present written statement called for by Court.— Where any party from whom a written statement is required under rule 1 or rule 9 fails to present the same within the time permitted or fixed by the Court, as the case may be, the Court shall pronounce judgment against him, or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit and on the pronouncement of such judgment a decree shall be drawn up.”

24. It would be relevant to refer to the dicta of **Satya Infrastructure Ltd. & Ors. v. Satya Infra & Estates Pvt. Ltd.**², wherein the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court held that in matters where the defendant is proceeded ex parte, the Court, upon its satisfaction, can pass a decree for permanent injunction on the basis of the pleadings filed on affidavit. The relevant part of the order reads as follows: -



“3. The plaintiffs have given the address of the defendant of Bangalore, Karnataka. The affidavit of service dated 26.11.2012 has been filed by the Court Clerk of the Advocate for the plaintiffs to the effect that notice was sent to the defendant by Blue Dart Courier on 15.11.2012 and was delivered on 16.11.2012. There is no reason for this Court to disbelieve the said affidavit emanating from the chamber of the Advocate for the plaintiffs and it has to be presumed that the shipment which has been reported to be delivered to the defendant contained the summons of the suit and notice of the application together with copies of the plaint, application and other documents etc. If it is discovered otherwise, of course the Advocate for the plaintiffs would be accountable. The defendant is thus proceeded against ex-parte.

4. The next question which arises is whether this Court should consider the application for interim relief and direct the plaintiffs to lead ex parte evidence. The counsel for the plaintiff's states that the plaintiffs are willing to give up the reliefs of delivery, of rendition of accounts and of recovery of damages, if the suit for the relief of injunction alone were to be heard today.

5. I am of the opinion that no purpose will be served in such cases by directing the plaintiffs to lead ex parte evidence in the form of affidavit by way of examination-in chief and which invariably is a repetition of the contents of the plaint. The plaint otherwise, as per the amended CPC, besides being verified, is also supported by affidavits of the plaintiffs. I fail to fathom any reason for according any additional sanctity to the affidavit by way of examination-in-chief than to the affidavit in support of the plaint or to any exhibit marks being put on the documents which have been filed by the plaintiffs and are already on record. I have therefore heard the counsel for the plaintiffs on merits qua the relief of injunction.”

(emphasis supplied)

25. In view of the fact that no written statement has been filed on behalf of the infringing Defendants, the averments made in the plaint have to be taken to be admitted. Further, since no affidavit of admission/denial has been filed in respect of the documents filed with the plaint, in terms of Rule 3 of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018, the same are deemed

² 2013 SCC OnLine Del 508



to have been admitted. The plaint has been duly verified and is supported by the affidavit of the Plaintiffs, and considering the circumstances set out hereinabove, this Court is of the considered view that no triable issues arise in the present matter. Consequently, the suit is fit to be decreed in favour of the Plaintiffs under the provisions of Order VIII Rule 10 of the CPC.

26. In view thereof, since there is no contest, this Court is of the view that the Plaintiffs are entitled to a relief of permanent injunction as claimed in the plaint. Accordingly, a decree of permanent injunction is hereby passed in favour of the Plaintiffs and against Defendant Nos. 1 and 2, in terms of relief sought in paragraph '70(a)' of the plaint, and in terms of the injunction order dated 29.05.2024.

27. In view of the fact that the remaining reliefs are disposed of as not pressed.

28. Defendant Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 6, which are the proforma parties, are deleted from the array of parties.

29. Amended memo of parties be filed within two [2] weeks.

30. It is, however, clarified that for the implementation of the decree granted in favour of the Plaintiffs vis-à-vis Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 in respect of prayer clause (a) hereinabove, upon the Plaintiffs approaching the proforma Defendants, the said Defendants shall comply with such request in fifteen [15] days. In the event the said Defendants have any reservations with respect to the request received or are of the opinion that the same is ambiguous, they shall communicate their decision to the Plaintiffs within fifteen [15] days, so as to enable the Plaintiffs to avail their remedies in accordance with law.

31. Let the decree sheet be drawn up accordingly.



32. With the aforesaid directions, the suit, along with the pending applications [if any], stands disposed of.
33. All future dates stand cancelled.
34. 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 17, 2025/msh/aa