



\$~37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **C.A.(COMM.IPD-TM) 72/2025 & I.A. 26622/2025**

JSW MG MOTOR INDIA PRIVATE LIMITEDAppellant
Through: Mr. Zeeshan Hashmi, Ms. Mitali
Yadav, Mr. Ankit and Ms. Jyoti
Rajpurohit, Advocates

versus

THE REGISTRAR OF TRADE MARKS & ANR.Respondents
Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC with Mr.
Om Ram and Mr. Mayank Sansanwal,
Advocates for R-1
Mr. G. S. Sahni, Advocate for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **19.11.2025**

1. This order is being passed in continuation of order dated 29.10.2025.
2. Ms. Nidhi Raman, learned counsel appearing for Respondent no. 1 states that she has received written instructions, which confirms that the application filed by the Appellant for change of its attorney was processed on 11.06.2025; however, inadvertently the Video Conferencing ('VC') link for the hearing was not sent to the new attorney.
 - 2.1 She states that in view of the assertions made by the Appellant in the appeal evidencing that he attempted to join the proceedings on 30.06.2025, Respondent no. 1 has no further submissions and will abide by the final result.
3. Learned counsel for Respondent no. 2 also states that in view of the facts, which have come on record, he is not objecting to the relief sought in this appeal.



4. This Court has considered the submissions of the parties.
5. The only reason given in the impugned order for treating the application TM No. 5361012 as abandoned is the non-appearance of the counsel for the Appellant herein, at the hearing dated 30.06.2025.
6. In view of the documents filed on record by the Appellant and the confirmation from the office of Respondent no. 1 that indeed no VC link was shared with the counsel for the Appellant; this Court is satisfied that the non-representation of the Appellant and its counsel at the hearing dated 30.06.2025 was not account of any reasons attributable to it. In fact, this Court is satisfied that the Appellant's counsel made diligent attempts to join the hearing.
7. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside, and the application TM No. 5361012 is restored.
8. The Respondent no. 1 is directed to issue a fresh notice to Appellant and Respondent no. 2 for a hearing within four (4) weeks.
9. Accordingly, the appeal stands disposed of. Pending applications, if any are 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

NOVEMBER 19, 2025/rhc