



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

OA Nos. 1147 to 1149 of 2025

IN C.S(COMM DIV) NO. 320 OF 2025

Spalon India Private Limited
2nd Floor Saba House No 209 A St Mary s Road
Alwarpet Chennai 600018

..Applicant(s)


Vs

Mr Mayur Sole Proprietor of Hair Bounce Unisex
Salon
12/2, 2nd Floor, Subbishku Elite,
Alpine Eco Road, Ferns City, Doddanekkundi,
Bengaluru, Karnataka-560037, India

..Respondent(s)

OA No. 1147 of 2025

PRAYER: To grant an ad-interim injunction restraining the Respondent/Defendant, their partners, their employees, officers, servants, agents and all others acting for and on their behalf from manufacturing, selling, distributing, exporting, advertising, offering for sale, any products, offering service and in any other manner directly or indirectly, online, or offline, dealing with any service in the name of HAIR BOUNCE UNISEX SALON and which is identical to the Plaintiffs registered trademark BOUNCE amounting to infringement of the Applicants/ Plaintiffs registered trademarks, bearing the applications Nos.1278997 under class 42, 2371476 under class 44, 2371477 under class 26, 2371478 under class 11, 2371479 under class 21, 2375804 under



class 41, 2375805 under class 44, 3381492 under class 44, 3381493 under class 44 and 5730239 under class 41 in any manner whatsoever, pending disposal of the suit.

OA No. 1148 of 2025

PRAYER: To grant an ad-interim injunction restraining the Respondent/Defendant, their partners, their employees, officers, servants, agents and all others acting for and on their behalf from manufacturing, selling, distributing, exporting, advertising, offering for sale, any products, offering service and in any other manner directly or indirectly, online, or offline, dealing with any service in the name of HAIR BOUNCE UNISEX SALON and or any other mark which is identical/similar to the Applicants/Plaintiffs registered trademarks BOUNCE and such other marks and passing off the goods/services of the Respondent/ Defendant as and for those of the Applicant/plaintiff in any manner whatsoever, pending disposal of the suit.

OA No. 1149 of 2025

PRAYER: To grant an ad-interim injunction restraining the Respondent/Defendant, their partners, their employees, officers, servants, agents and all others acting for and on their behalf from using mark HARI HAIR BOUNCE UNSEX SALON and or any mark which is deceptively similar and or identical to the Applicants/ Plaintiffs registered trademark BOUNCE in any of the websites, domain names, social media platforms, email address, mobile application and other intermediaries in any language in any manner whatsoever,



pending disposal of the suit.

WEB COPY

In all applications

For Applicant(s): Ms.Reshma Rajagopal
for M/s.MS Bharath

Order

At the hearing on 28.01.2026, the Registry was directed to print the name of the respondent in the cause list. The name of the respondent is printed in the cause list for today's hearing. The respondent, however, continues to remain unrepresented.

2. While granting an ad interim injunction on 05.01.2026, it was recorded, in relevant part, as under:

"3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff invited my attention to the registration of the word mark BOUNCE in Class 44 in relation to hygiene and beauty care. He also points out that multiple word and device mark registrations were obtained by the plaintiff by asserting use since 12.02.2004. He next invited my attention to the impugned mark HAIR BOUNCE UNISEX SALON. In spite of issuance of cease and desist notice before filing the suit, he submits that the defendant did not even respond thereto.

4. The plaintiff has placed on record evidence that it is the prior user of the mark BOUNCE from 12.02.2004. The defendant's marks contain the word BOUNCE. Both the plaintiff and the defendant are engaged in the provision of identical services.



5. *Considering the aforesaid, it is likely that the usage of the impugned marks would cause confusion or deception to the relevant section of the public. Unless restrained at this juncture, it is also likely that irreparable hardship would be caused to the plaintiff. Therefore, the order of interim injunction as prayed for in these two applications is granted until the next date of hearing.”*

3. For reasons set out above and in view of the respondent continuing to remain unrepresented in these proceedings, the order of interim injunction in O.A.Nos.1147 to 1149 of 2025 is made absolute and the said applications are disposed of.

23-02-2026
(1/2)

RNA



WEB COPY

OA No. 1147 of 2



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY J.

RNA

**OA Nos. 1147 to 1149 of 2025
IN C.S(COMM DIV) NO. 320 OF 2025**

**23-02-2026
(1/2)**