



\$~22

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

+ C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 33/2025 & I.A. 16288/2025

KRBL LIMITED

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Shravan Bansal and Mr. Indraneil Choudhary, Advocates

versus

SHAILENDRA CHATURVEDI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Rachana Joshi Issar and Mr. Svarit Uniyal Mishra, Advocates for R-1

Ms. Amita Singh, proxy counsel for Mr. Gaurav Barathi (SPC), Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

17.10.2025

1. Learned counsel for the Appellant states that the Appellant has obtained instructions and, subject to Respondent No. 1 being bound down to his statement recorded at paragraph '22(b)' of the impugned order, the Appellant is willing to have the appeal disposed of. Paragraph '22(b)' reads as under:-

“b) The Applicant says and submits that after adoption of the mark “DOON MEMORIES” the Applicant has started using the trade mark “DOON MEMORIES” with regard to bakery products like preparations made from cereals, bread, pastry and confectionery. The Applicant has not started using the mark other than the bakery products. The Opponent is in the business of rice as alleged. The Applicant does not want to involve in any dispute and therefore, if Opponent is agree to withdraw the Opposition in the matter, the Applicant undertakes to delete the word “Rice” and other description of goods except bakery product i.e.



preparations made from cereals, bread, pastry and confectionery, from the Application”

- 1.1. He states that the phrase confectionery appearing in the aforesaid paragraph (b) should be understood in the context of bakery products only.
2. In response, learned counsel for the Respondent No. 1 states that Respondent No. 1 is willing to remain bound by the statement recorded at paragraph ‘22(b)’ of the impugned order dated 12.02.2025, and he undertakes not to use this mark for ‘Rice’ as already recorded therein. She states that Respondent No. 1 will use the mark for bakery products i.e. preparations made from cereals, bread, pastry and confectionery as stated therein.
3. The submissions of the Respondent No. 1 as recorded in paragraph ‘22(b)’ are unequivocal and unambiguous. Respondent No. 1 is bound down to the said statement.
4. In case Respondent No. 1 violates his undertaking, the Appellant will be at liberty to revive this appeal.
5. The Registrar of Trademarks is accordingly directed to amend the Respondent No. 1’s TM Registration No. 421683 in the details of goods and services to record the products as set out in paragraph 22(b) only i.e., **bakery products i.e. preparations made from cereals, bread, pastry and confectionery.**
6. The Registrar of Trademarks is directed to amend the TM certificate within four (4) weeks. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of Registrar will communicate this order for information and compliance.
7. With the aforesaid directions, the appeal stands disposed of as withdrawn.
8. Future dates, if any, stand cancelled.



9. The pending applications stand disposed of.
10. 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 order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

OCTOBER 17, 2025/rhc/aa