WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI

WP(IPD) No. 33 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA011058832026}

Jai Rajendra Impex
A Company Incorporated Inder The Companies
Act 1956, Registered Office At Plot No.60, Cie,
Gandhinagar, Ida, Hyderabad,- 500037,
Represented By Its Director

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Registrar of Trade Marks,
Trade Marks Registry, Chennai
Intellectual Property Rights Building Industrial
Estate SIDCO RMD, Godown Area, GST Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

..Respondent(s)

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent to allow the Petitioner herein to inspect documents, pursuant to requests submitted by the petitioner to the Respondent on 06.11.2025 and reiterated on 25.01.2026 and to provide Certified Copies of the documents submitted by the Petitioner to the Respondent on 03.12.2007 and pass such other Orders.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. R. Sathish Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr. J. Madanagopal Rao SCGC

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

O R D E R

The Writ Petition has been filed seeking limited relief by way of a writ of mandamus to permit the petitioner to inspect the documents before the Trade Marks Registry.

2. Mr.J.Madanagopal Roa, learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel appearing for the official respondent, even on the last occasion, brought to my notice that, in the 2015 floods that hit Chennai, the Trade Marks Registry was completely flooded and the documents that are now sought to be inspected are not available in the Registry of the respondent. However, he sought for a week's time to get confirmed instructions in this regard.

3. Today, Mr.Madanagopal Roa, leaned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel for the respondent, reiterates the averment already made on 12.10.2026 and states that the documents are unavailable and therefore, the limited relief sought by the petitioner cannot be granted.

4. Mr.R.Sathish Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, fairly states that the instructions received by the respondent can be recorded so that, based on the same, the petitioner may be in a position to pursue the matter further in the pending appeal.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. In the light of the above, the fact that the petitioner claims to have filed the original documents with the respondent, namely the Trade Marks Registry and subsequently, sought inspection of the file to establish the fact that the originals were, in fact, filed, unfortunately, during the devastating floods of December 2015, the Trade Marks Registry was fully inundated and the respondent is not in a position to give inspection since, according to the respondent, all the documents that were available in the Registry in December 2015 were destroyed in the said floods, is recorded.

6. In view thereof, I do not see any scope for issuing a positive direction in favour of the petitioner, as prayed for. However, it would suffice to record the fact that, though the petitioner claims to have filed the original documents, the respondent is unable to give inspection for reasons beyond its control. It is for the petitioner to pursue such remedies as may be available in the pending appeal.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is closed. No costs.

28-10-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
AT

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

P.B.BALAJI, J.

AT

WEB COPY

To
The Registrar of Trade Marks,
Trade Marks Registry, Chennai
Intellectual Property Rights Building Industrial Estate SIDCO RMD,
Godown Area, GST Road, Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

WP(IPD) No. 33 of 2026

28-10-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis