



WEB COPY



O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025

in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.02.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR
RAMAMOORTHY**

O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025

in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025

Spalon India Private Limited
represented by its Authorised Signatory
Ms.Sneh Asit Koticha,
2nd Floor, Saba House,
No.209/A, St. Mary's Road,
Alwarpet, Chennai – 600 018.

... Applicant in
both applications

vs.

Mr.Suresh
Sole Proprietor of Bounce, The Family Saloon,
D.No.10-53-265/5, Near Pydah Degree College,
Opp. Bombay Food Zone,
Raghavendraswamy Temple Down Road,
Ram Nagar – 530 002,
Visakhapatnam.

... Respondent in
both applications

For Applicant

: Mr.M.S.Bharath
in both applications



WEB COPY



*O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025
in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025*

COMMON ORDER

At the hearing on 28.01.2026, the tracking report enclosed with affidavit of service dated 09.01.2026 was taken note of and it was recorded that the defendant had refused to receive notice in the interim applications. After directing that the name of the respondent be printed in the cause list for the hearing on 05.01.2026, the applicant/plaintiff was heard on 05.01.2026. On that date, an order of interim injunction was granted until the next date of hearing, and the plaintiff was permitted to communicate the order to the defendant.

2. Pursuant thereto, the plaintiff has filed affidavit of service dated 09.01.2026 enclosing the tracking report evidencing refusal by the defendant to receive notice.

3. In these circumstances, the matter is proceeded with in the absence of the defendant. At the hearing on 05.01.2026, it was recorded in the relevant paragraphs as under:



WEB COPY



O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025
in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025

'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.'

4. For reasons set out in the above extracted paragraphs, the orders of interim injunction are made absolute and these applications are allowed.

16.02.2026

mmi



WEB COPY



*O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025
in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025*

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY,J.

mmi

O.A.Nos.1143 and 1144 of 2025
in C.S(Comm.Div)No.319 of 2025

16.02.2026