



\$~9

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ FAO(OS) (COMM) 29/2024&CM APPL. 10764/2024

INSTITUTE OF DIRECTORS

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Shwetasree Majumder, Ms. Priya Adlakha, Ms. Ruchika Yadav, Mr. Rishi Mishra, Advs.

versus

WORLDDEV CORP TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS SOLUTIONS PVT LTD & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Sanjay Singh Adv.
Mr. Saurabh Kansal, Mr. Raghav Vij, Mr Deepak Pandey Advs.

CORAM:

JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **26.02.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present appeal arises out of the impugned order dated 11th December, 2023 (*hereinafter, 'the impugned order'*) by which the application for interim injunction filed by the Appellant/Plaintiff has been rejected by the Id. Single Judge.
3. The competing trade marks/ names in this case are '*Institute of Directors*' belonging to the Appellant/Plaintiff and '*Directors Institute*' belonging to the Respondent No. 1/Defendant.
4. The Appellant/Plaintiff's case is that it was established as a Society on 12th July, 1990 and it provides developmental training for Corporate



Directors, having its offices across the country in New Delhi, Bangalore, Hyderabad, Madras etc.

5. As per the plaint filed by the Appellants before the Id. Single Judge, the Appellant has various trademark registrations as well, however, one trademark had a disclaimer on the descriptive matter. On the basis of this disclaimer, the Id. Single Judge had rejected the interim injunction application filed by the Appellant. Hence, the present appeal.

6. This Court had heard the matter on 5th February, 2026 and had *prima facie* opined as under:

“12. The Appellant and the Respondents are clearly in the same area of professional services that they provide. This Court is of the prima facie opinion that irrespective of the trade mark registrations, in a passing off action, goodwill is to be protected and ultimately, any possibility of confusion has to be eliminated.

13. Under these circumstances, the Court has put to Counsel for the Respondents that the name 'Directors Institute' and 'Institute of Directors' could be confused by consumers who want to avail of the services.

14. Hence, without prejudice, the Respondents' Counsel may seek instructions as to whether the Respondents would be willing to add the first word of its corporate name 'Worlddevcorp' along with 'Directors Institute' as a prefix to its business name.

15. The Respondents are free to consider using any other prefix as well, which would sufficiently distinguish it from the Appellant.

16. Accordingly, let the competent officials of both sides be present on the next date of hearing.”



7. As can be seen from the above order passed, this Court is of the opinion that the addition of a prefix to the mark of the Respondent No. 1/ Defendant could eliminate any chances of confusion between the two names.

8. While the words 'Institute' and 'Director' themselves cannot be monopolised, however, to the extent that the Appellant/Plaintiff enjoys a goodwill and reputation, the same deserves to be safeguarded.

9. The parties are today represented before the Court. On behalf of the Appellant/Plaintiff Mr. Manoj Kishor Raut, CEO of the Company is present in Court along with Mr. Ashok Kapoor, Director General of the Company.

10. On behalf of the Respondents, Mr. Heval Mehta, CEO, Mr. Zeeshaan Pathan, CEO and Mr. Ayub Sheikh, CEO are present in Court.

11. Mr. Saurabh Kansal, Id. Counsel for the Respondents has submitted on the instructions that the Respondents have a registered trademark bearing No. 5579804 wherein for the word mark '*Worlddevcorp*', the Respondents are willing to add the words *World Development Corporation- Directors Institute*'.

12. On behalf of the Appellant, it is stated that the above change of the mark is acceptable to them.

13. Accordingly, the appeal is disposed of as settled in the following terms:

- I. The Respondents shall henceforth use the mark/name as depicted below:

“World Development Corporation Directors’ Institute”

- II. In the above name/mark, there shall be no undue emphasis given to the words '*Directors Institute*' to the extent possible, while maintaining the necessary aesthetics;



- III. The same font and colour shall be used by the Respondents as is being currently used by them;
- IV. The wordmark, as agreed between parties and approved by the Court today, shall be used with effect from 31st April, 2026 in all printed materials, online platforms, publicity materials, communications etc. by the Respondents.
14. If there are any pending trademark applications for the mark '*Directors Institute*', the same shall also be modified with the new name mark.
15. Let the detailed terms of settlement be filed on record by the parties to this effect within two weeks.
16. Ld. Counsel for the parties shall exchange and finalise the terms of the settlement.
17. The final terms of settlement shall be filed before Id. Single Judge in the suit itself.
18. The appeal is disposed of in these terms, as settled between the parties.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

MADHU JAIN, J.

FEBRUARY 26, 2026/ prg/ss