Order QR

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2026

CORAM

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

WP(IPD) Nos. 30 and 31 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA011793542026}

C R I Amalgamations Private Limited,
Having its registered office at
7/46-1, Keeranatham Road,
Saravanampatti, Coimbatore.
Tamil Nadu- 641 035,
Represented by its Director
Mr.G.Soundararajan.

..Petitioner(s)
in both W.Ps

Vs

The Registrar of Trademarks,
Trademarks Registry,
Intellectual property Office Building,
IP building, G.S.T.Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

..Respondent(s)
in both W.Ps

Prayer in W.P. No.30 of 2026: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the Respondent to enter and record the name of the Petitioner as the Subsequent Registered proprietor of Trademarks that are the subject matter of the order dated 25.06.2008 passed by the Deputy Registrar of Trademarks.

Prayer in W.P. No.31 of 2026: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the Respondent to communicate the order passed on Form TM-24 dated 11.03.2016 and consequently enter and record the name of the petitioner as the subsequent Registered Proprietor of the Trademarks that are the subject matter of the said

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

WEB COPY

form TM-24 dated 11.03.2016.

For Petitioner(s): Mrs. Elizabeth Seshadri

For Respondent(s): Mr. S. Nelson (CGSC)

COMMON ORDER

Heard Mrs. Elizabeth Seshadri, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Nelson, learned Central Government Standing Counsel for the respondent.

2. W.P. No. 30 of 2026 has been filed for the issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the respondent to enter and record the name of the petitioner, as a subsequent registered proprietor of the trademarks that are the subject matter of the order dated 25.06.2008.

3. Mr. Nelson, learned Central Government Standing Counsel, states that the respondent is now ready to record the assignment in favour of the petitioner in the register maintained by the respondent. He further states that the delay occurred only on account of deficit Court fee, which was subsequently made good only in the year 2016. Therefore, he intends that it is not correct to state that the application has not been disposed of ever since 2007 onwards.

4. Insofar as W.P.No.31 of 2026, relating to Form TM-24 dated 11.03.2016 is concerned, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the

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

WEB COPY

petition relates to 33 trademarks that have been assigned in favour of the petitioner and in respect of which the petitioner's name is yet to be recorded in the records of the respondent.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner also brings to my notice that a hearing was conducted on 09.10.2024 and that, subsequent to the effective virtual hearing, the name of the petitioner in respect of one of the trademarks, already stands reflected in the records of the respondent. However, insofar as the remaining 32 trademarks are concerned, no action has been taken, despite the passage of a decade, even though the Rules prescribe an outer limit of three months, for recording any such assignment.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent states that hearing in respect of Form TM-24 was fixed on 01.11.2023 and that, unfortunately, no further hearing took place thereafter. Hence, the respondent seeks short accommodation to fix a date for enquiry and thereafter, pass appropriate orders.

7. I do not see any reason why a fresh enquiry is necessary in the matter, especially since a hearing was already conducted on 09.10.2024. The respondent has acted upon the request of the petitioner, insofar as one of the trademarks is concerned and has effected necessary name change. The hearing was in respect of all the 33 trademarks and the affidavit filed in support of the

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

WEB COPY

writ petition also discloses the same. There is no counter filed to the said affirmative statements made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petiton. Therefore, I do not see any real purpose in requiring a further enquiry in the matter.

8. The learned counsel for the respondent, Mr.Nelson, however, states that the petitioner has paid excess application fees and that the respondent requires an enquiry.

9. The respondent is aware of the actual amount that has been paid for effecting the name change in favour of the petitioner. If at all, the petitioner has paid any excess amount, it is always open to the respondent to refund the excess amount. I do not see why the petitioner should be called for an enquiry over and again when an effective enquiry has already been conducted on 09.10.2024.

10. In the light of the above, I am inclined to allow both the writ petitions.

11. In W.P.No. 30 of 2026, the respondent is directed to effect the name change by recording the name of the petitioner in the records of the respondent, within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

12. Insofar as W.P.No.31 of 2026 is concerned, the respondent shall carry out the necessary amendments in the Register of Trademarks and record the

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

WEB COPY

name of the petitioner within a period of eight weeks. If any refund is to be made to the writ petitioner, the same shall be done within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

13. With the above directions, these Writ Petitions are allowed. No costs.

28-10-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
AT

To
The Registrar of Trademarks,
Trademarks Registry,
Intellectual property Office Building,
IP building, G.S.T.Road,
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.

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

WEB COPY

P.B.BALAJI, J.

AT

WP(IPD) Nos. 30 and 31 of 2026

28-10-2026

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