



\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **FAO(OS) (COMM) 110/2026**

YESHA SANT DESIGNS PVT. LTD.

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Swathi Sukumar, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Karan Bajaj, Mr. Rupin Bahl, Mr.
Dhruv Nayar and Ms. Aastha Arora,
Advs.

versus

VIDHI SINGHAL & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Paras Manchanda, Mr
Raghwendra Pratap Rao, Mr
Gyanendra Shukla and Ms Ridhi
Goyal, Advocates for R1.
Mr. Varun Pathak, Ms. Ameer Rana,
Ms. Radhika Roy and Ms. Anannya
Gogoi, Advs. for R3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **21.04.2026**

CM APPL. 25218/2026 and CM APPL. 25219/2026 (Exemptions)

1. Exemptions are allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

FAO(OS) (COMM) 110/2026 CM APPL. 25217/2026

3. This appeal has been filed by the appellant challenging the ex-parte



ad-interim injunction order dated 24.03.2026 of the learned Single Judge only to the extent that the learned Single Judge has not restrained the respondent no. 1 herein from selling/manufacturing the two shirt designs, which were originally created by the appellant. The designs have been set out at pages 219-220 of this paper-book.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the appellant submits that though the learned Single Judge by the impugned order has restrained the respondent no. 1 from using the appellant's registered mark 'Yesha Sant' and directed respondent no. 1 to take down all images of the shirt designs from the social media accounts, however, the appellant is also seeking a restraint against respondent no. 1 from selling/manufacturing the shirt designs.

5. To this, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 1 states that the said respondent is neither selling nor manufacturing the apparels depicted by the appellant at page nos. 219 and 220 of the paper-book. He states that respondent no. 1 does not admit to any wrong doing however, it is not contesting the ad-interim injunction granted by the learned Single Judge.

6. In response, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant submits that the said submission of respondent no. 1 be taken on record and he may be directed to file an affidavit to this effect.

7. At this stage, Mr. Karan Bajaj, learned counsel for the appellant states that the impugned order dated 24.03.2026 be read against the respondent no. 1 of the suit only. He clarifies that the same may not be read against respondent no. 3 in the suit.

8. He also states that in view of the statement made by the counsel for respondent no. 1, and by making the impugned injunction order passed by the learned Single Judge as permanent against respondent no. 1, the present



appeal be disposed of and the suit be decreed in terms of the injunction order passed on 24.03.2026. He prays that respondent no. 1 be directed to file an affidavit in terms of the statement made before this Court.

9. He clarifies that in view of the fact that the infringing images uploaded by respondent no. 1 have been taken down and respondent no. 1 has stated that it is not selling or manufacturing the infringing goods on the e-commerce platform of respondent no. 2, he is not pressing for any further reliefs against respondent no. 2.

10. In reply, learned counsel for respondent no. 1 states that he will file an affidavit of respondent no. 1 confirming the aforesaid submissions within two days along with his vakalatnama.

11. Mr. Varun Pathak, learned counsel for respondent no. 3 states that the injunction order dated 24.03.2026 has already been complied with and there is no further role of respondent no. 3 in this matter. He therefore prays that the record be corrected to this extent and the permanent injunction be granted against respondent no. 1 only.

12. In reply, learned counsel for appellant states that he has no objection to the prayer of respondent no. 3 and does not seek a final decree of injunction against respondent no. 3.

13. The statement of respondent no. 1 recorded hereinabove at paragraph 5 is taken on record and she is bound down to the same.

14. We have heard the learned counsels for the parties. In view of the submissions of the appellant and respondent no. 1, it is apparent that the parties are not at issue on any question of law or fact and therefore, the underlying suit i.e., CS (COMM) 299/2026 itself can be decreed in terms of Order XV Rule 1 CPC.



15. Accordingly, the interim injunction order dated 24.03.2026 is made permanent *qua* respondent no. 1 and a decree of permanent injunction is hereby passed in favour of the appellant/plaintiff and against respondent no. 1/defendant no. 1 in terms of paragraph 35 of the order dated 24.03.2026. The registry is directed to draw up a decree in terms thereof.

16. The suit *qua* respondent no. 2/defendant no. 2 and respondent no. 3/defendant no. 3 is disposed of as not pressed. In case, the plaintiff notices any future violations on the e-commerce platform of respondent no. 2, its rights and contentions are reserved.

17. With the aforesaid directions, the present appeal is disposed of. The pending application is also disposed of as having become infructuous.

18. A copy of this order be placed on the record of CS(COMM) 299/2026.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

APRIL 21, 2026/sr