$~36

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

\+ CS(COMM) 215/2026

GLAXO GROUP LIMITED & ANR. .....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Urfee Roomi, Mr. Janaki Arun, Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Mr. Aneja Chaudhury and Ms. Angela Arora, Advocates.

versus

ANAND JAIN, TRADING AS JAIN GROUP/ JANKEM LIFE SCIENCE .....Defendant

Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

O R D E R

% **10.03.2026**

I.A. 5950/2026 (Additional Documents)

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff under Order XI Rule 1(4) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (*'CPC'*) as applicable to commercial suits under the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (*'CC Act'*) seeking leave to place on record additional documents.

2. The plaintiff is permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the CC Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

3. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

I.A. 5951/2026 (Pre-Institution Mediation)

4. This is an application filed by the plaintiff seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation mediation under Section 12A of the CC Act.

5. As the present matter contemplates urgent interim relief, in light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Yamini Manohar vs. T.K.D. Keerthi: (2024) 5 SCC 815***, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

mediation is granted.

6. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 5952/2026 (Exemption)

7. This is an application filed on behalf of the plaintiff under Section 151 of CPC seeking exemption from filing clear and true typed copies of the documents.

8. Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The clear and typed/translated copies of the documents with proper margins of the dim annexures be filed within four weeks with an advance copy to the defendant.

9. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 5953/2026 (Seeking permission to file document in sealed cover)

10. This is an application under Section 151 of the CPC read with Rule 19(2) and (3) of the Delhi High Court Intellectual Property Rights Division Rules, 2022, filed on behalf of the plaintiff seeking permission to file documents in sealed cover.

11. For the reasons stated, the application is allowed. The confidential data relating to the sales figures and sales volumes of plaintiff's products be filed in a sealed cover within four weeks from date.

12. The application stands disposed of.

I.A. 5949/2026 (Order XXXIX Rules 1& 2, CPC)

13. Present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 of CPC, 1908 seeking *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction against the defendant.

14. Plaintiff claims to be headquartered in the United Kingdom and traces its routes to the year 1715. It claims to be operating in 75 countries worldwide and has manufacturing sites globally. The worldwide turnover of the plaintiff from the year 2014 to the year 2025 in a tabulated form is extracted hereunder:-

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

YEAR	ANNUAL TURNOVER (in million GBP)	ANNUAL TURNOVER (in crores INR)
2014	23,006	281,823.5
2015	23,923	292,280
2016	27,889	342,597
2017	30,186	369,174.78
2018	30,821	377,120
2019	33,754	413,940
2020	34,099	417,712.75
2021	24,696	3,019.8
2022	29,324	360,685
2023	30,328	371,011
2024	31,376	384,983.52
2025	32, 667	401,150

15. The plaintiff claims to have made its presence in India since the year 1919 through distributors and commenced direct trading in the year 1924. Plaintiff no.2's predecessor in interest, H.J. Foster & Company Limited was incorporated in November, 1924 and changed its name to Glaxo Laboratories (India) Pvt. Ltd. in the year 1949. Subsequently, the plaintiff came to be known as GlaxoSmithKline Pharmaceuticals Limited. The annual sales figure of plaintiff no.2 for the year 2014 was Rs.3,35,854 Lakhs which increased to Rs.3,86,605 Lakhs in the year 2025.

16. The plaintiff claims to have been awarded many prestigious awards and recognitions for its contribution to the medicinal world in India. The details of some of such awards and recognitions are annexed as Document-16 to the plaint.

17. Plaintiff claims to have registered the trademark ZINETAC in India in Class 5 in the year 1985 and commenced the use of such mark from the year 1986. Documents to evidence use of trademark ZINETAC is annexed with the plaint as Document-17. Plaintiff claims that the mark ZINETAC is inherently distinctive and does not convey a description of the composition of plaintiff's pharmaceutical and medicinal products. Plaintiff also have sold pharmaceuticals and medicinal preparations bearing the plaintiff's mark and packaging featuring distinctive get-up and layout, sizes and shapes,

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

placement and arrangement of wordings and colour schemes. The essential features of the plaintiff's packaging from the year of first use is tabulated hereunder:-

Plaintiff's Packaging	Essential Features	Year of First Use
	• The overall colour scheme is that of a silver aluminium base with the printed matter appearing in black lettering and the GSK logo appearing in black colour. • The name of the active ingredient and dosage of the tablets "RANITIDINE TABLETS I.P. 150 MG" is printed in relatively large black lettering on the left side of the strip. • Below this, in black lettering, appears the Plaintiff's ZINETAC mark with only the letter Z in upper case. Beneath the ZINETAC mark, a statement regarding the active ingredient contained in each tablet, *i.e.*, "Each uncoated tablet contains Ranitidine Hydrochloride I.P. 168 mg equivalent to Ranitidine 150 mg", is written in small black lettering.	1986
	• On the right side, is a red coloured rectangular strip which is a regulatory requirement for SCHEDULE-H prescription drugs, below which are details pertaining to the directions and manner of use of the tablets, *i.e.*, "TO BE USED AS DIRECTED BY PHYSICIANS", manner of storage of the tablets and a warning, *i.e.*, "STORE AT A TEMPERATURE BELOW 30 DEGREES CELSIUS, PROTECTED FROM LIGHT AND MOISTURE" and "KEEP OUT OF REACH OF CHILDREN", and the name of the manufacturer, address and the manufacturer license number, all in black lettering. • Vertical lines in mustard yellow run along both the vertical edges of the strip packaging.	
	• The packaging has a white base with a light green strip on the left and a dark green strip on the right. The GSK logo appears in the front. • The word AUGMENTIN appearing in white letters is enclosed in a green-coloured rectangular box with a red border. The number 625 (signifying milligrams of dosage per tablet) appears in white lettering in a red box on the right side of the words AUGMENTIN. The number 625 is	1997

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

	followed by the words DUO in a green-red lettering written in an artistic manner. • The words "AMOXYCILLIN AND POTASSIUM CLAVULANATE TABLETS IP" are printed in relatively large black lettering on the front of the packaging. • Below the AUGMENTIN mark, the packaging contains information regarding ingredients, usage warning, etc. • The back side of the packaging also contains the AUGMENTIN mark along with the words 625 and DUO written in an identical manner as on the front of the packaging. • The right side of the packaging contains the text mentioning that the medicine is a SCHEDULE – H prescription drug, and the manufacturer's details.	
	• The overall colour scheme of the packaging is purple with the tablets placed in three (3) rows and five (5) columns, or in five (5) rows and three (3) columns. • On the background of the packaging, the words, 'CALPOL', 'CALPOL 500', 'PARACETAMOL TABLETS IP 650' are written either in a slant or straight, across the packaging. • The colour of the tablet is white, and the	2010
	strip packaging is rectangular in shape with curved edges.	
	• The overall colour scheme is that of a silver aluminium base with the printed matter appearing in red lettering and the GSK logo appearing in black colour. • The name of the active ingredient and dosage of the tablets "BETAMETHASONE SODIUM PHOSPHATE TABLETS I.P. 0.5 MG" is printed in relatively large red lettering on the front and top of the packaging. • Below this, in red letters, appears the BETNESOL mark between two parallel red coloured lines. Beneath the BETNESOL mark, in small red letters, is written a statement regarding the active ingredient contained in each tablet, i.e., "Each uncoated tablet contains Betamethasone Sodium Phosphate I.P. equivalent to Betamethasone 0.5 mg". • This is followed by a red coloured rectangular strip, which is a regulatory requirement for SCHEDULE-H	2018

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

	prescription drugs, below which are details pertaining to the directions and manner of use of the tablets, i.e., "TO BE USED AS DIRECTED BY PHYSICIANS", manner of storage of tablets and a warning, i.e., "STORE AT A TEMPERATURE BELOW 30 DEGREE CELSIUS, PROTECTED FROM LIGHT" and "KEEP OUT OF REACH OF CHILDREN", and the name of the manufacturer, address and the manufacturer licence number, all in red lettering. • On both the left and right sides of the packaging, the BETNESOL mark appears repeatedly in red lettering, along the vertical sides of the packaging.	
	• The packaging has a white base with red lettering. The GSK logo appears in front. • The lower half of the front and top of the packaging features a red stripe. • The BETNESOL mark appears in red font in the front left corner of the top and front of the packaging. • The wording "BETAMETHASONE SODIUM PHOSPHATE TABLETS IP 0.5 MG" is printed in relatively large red lettering on the front of the packaging. • The right side of the packaging features a	
	white base with font written in red colour. The written text pertains to manufacturer license no., details of the manufacturer, trademark details, etc. • The left side of the packaging also features a white base with font written in red colour. The written text pertains to ingredients of the product, usage warning and text mentioning that the medicine is a Schedule – H prescription drug.	

18. Plaintiff claims that the continuous use of plaintiff's mark and packaging have led the consumers to associate the mark and packaging solely and exclusively with the plaintiff and owing to the distinctiveness, the packaging would constitute protectable trade dress under Section 2(1)(m) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. It is also asserted that such packagings are original artistic works defined in the Copyright Act, 1957 and plaintiff would be the owner of the copyright in such artistic works.

19. Plaintiff states that in September, 2019, on account of suspicion of

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

impurity in goods containing the active ingredient Ranitidine, the plaintiff suspended production of goods containing the said ingredient. It voluntarily recalled its products including the tablets bearing trademark ZINETAC and packaging.

20. For the products which are subject matter of the present suit, the marketing figures of such products in the last few years in a tabulated form are extracted hereunder:-

ZINETAC

Year Ending	MARKETING SPEND (IN '000 INR)
2014	More than 3900
2015	More than 8000
2016	More than 14600
2017	More than 6200
2018	More than 100
2019	More than 300

AUGMENTIN

Year Ending	MARKETING SPEND (IN '000 INR)
2020	More than 90,000
2021	More than 1,00,000
2022	More than 1,00,000
2023	More than 74,000
2024	More than 1,70,000

CALPOL

Year Ending	MARKETING SPEND (IN '000 INR)
2020	More than 50,000
2021	More than 63000
2022	More than 28000
2023	More than 38000
2024	More than 41000

BETNESOL

Year Ending	MARKETING SPEND (IN '000 INR)
2017	4,586
2018	176
2019	Not Available
2020	43
2021	More than 40
2022	Not available
2023	More than 20

21. Plaintiff has been extremely vigilant in protecting and enforcing its rights in trademarks and copyrights which is demonstrable by the list of

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

enforcement actions undertaken by it before this Court which are annexed as Document-25 to the plaint.

22. The defendant is one Mr. Anand Jain, trading as Jankem Life Science/Jain Group located in Indore, Madhya Pradesh and other locations detailed in para 37 of the plaint.

23. Plaintiff claims that in September, 2023, it gained knowledge that the defendant was involved in manufacture, marketing and sale of pharmaceuticals and medicinal preparations bearing the defendant's old marks and packaging which were identical/deceptively similar to the plaintiff's mark and packaging. The plaintiff claims that the investigation which was got conducted revealed that the defendant is using its old marks and packaging for products which were offered for sale both through the offline channels as also through the third party e-commerce websites. The extracts of webpages of third party websites are available as Document-27 to the plaint.

24. On 30.11.2023, a legal notice of cease and desist was issued to the defendant and the reminder was sent on 08.12.2023. Though by the response dated 12.12.2023, the defendant denied the contents of plaintiff's notice, however, agreed to cease the use of its old marks and packaging. On account of the fact that no compliance was reported, the plaintiff sent a number of reminders whereafter *vide* the reply dated 27.04.2024, the defendant requested for some time to discard the old marks and packaging. It appears that there were a number of correspondences exchanged between the parties in the interregnum and consequently, the defendant is stated to have executed an Undertaking on 31.07.2024 agreeing to completely cease use of old marks and packaging by 31.08.2024 and destroy all remaining inventory of goods bearing the defendant's old marks and packaging as well as takedown all online listings.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

25. Despite such Undertaking, it appears that the defendant did not comply with the terms therein, which was found by the plaintiff in the month of April, 2025. The investigations revealed that the defendant had launched medicinal and pharmaceuticals preparations bearing the marks BETAJAN and BETAJOX in new packaging, which was deceptively similar to plaintiff's packaging of its product BETNESOL. The online listings also featured products bearing the trademarks JANTAC and MOXYCROT. A cease and desist notice was yet again issued by the plaintiff on 26.05.2025 reminding the defendant of the Undertaking executed on 31.07.2024, followed by a number of reminders. *Vide* response dated 02.07.2025, the defendant denied the allegations.

26. The investigator appointed by the plaintiff was able to obtain samples of pharmaceuticals preparations bearing the new BETAJAN and BETAJOX packaging of the defendant under an invoice dated 22.09.2025 alongwith MOXYCROT tablets.

27. The side by side comparison of the rival marks and packaging alongwith the changes made by the defendant to his mark and packaging are extracted hereunder:-

S. No.	Plaintiff's Mark and Packaging	Defendant's Mark and Packaging	Marks and Packaging covered by Undertakings executed by Defendant	Changes made by the Defendant
1.	ZINETAC	JANTAC	JANTAC	Clearly, the mark JANTAC is covered under the scope of the undertakings executed dated July 31, 2024, and amounts to breach of the undertakings.
2.	ZINETAC mark and packaging	Current JANTAC packaging	JANTAC old packaging	Clearly, the JANTAC packaging is covered under the scope of the undertakings executed dated July 31, 2024, and amounts to breach of the undertakings.

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

3.	ZINETAC mark and packaging	RANIJOX tablet packaging	N/A	The overall impression of the Defendant's RANIJOX packaging is similar to the Plaintiff's ZINETAC Packaging. It appears that the Defendant has consciously and slavishly imitated or copied the Plaintiff's ZINETAC packaging, including the colour combination, and placement of elements such as vertical orange-coloured stripes on the left and right, and horizontal red stripes placed on the right side, in between the orange stripes. Clearly, this amounts to the breach of undertakings executed on July 31, 2024.
4.	BETNESOL packaging	Current BETAJAN packaging	BETAJAN old packaging	The Defendant has consciously and slavishly imitated or copied not only the colour scheme, but also the get-up of the Plaintiff's BETNESOL packaging in the newly adopted BETAJAN packaging. The Defendant has merely removed the recurring GSK logo from the Plaintiff's BETNESOL packaging to arrive at the Defendant's BETAJAN packaging. Clearly, the newly adopted BETAJAN packaging is covered under the scope of the undertakings executed dated July 31, 2024, and amounts to breach of the undertakings.
5.	BETNESOL packaging	BETAJOX packaging	BETAJOX Old packaging	The Defendant has consciously and slavishly imitated or copied not only the color scheme, but also the get-up of the Plaintiff's BETNESOL packaging. The Defendant has merely removed the recurring GSK logo from the Plaintiff's BETNESOL packaging to arrive at

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

				the Defendant's newly adopted BETAJOX packaging. Clearly, the newly adopted BETAJOX packaging is covered under the scope of the undertakings executed dated July 31, 2024, and amounts to breach of the undertakings.
6.	AUGMENTIN packaging 	MOXYCROT packaging 	MOXYCROT old packaging 	Clearly, the MOXYCROT packaging is covered under the scope of the undertakings executed dated July 31, 2024, and amounts to breach of the undertakings.
7.	CALPOL packaging 	PARAJAN tablet packaging 	N/A	The overall impression of the Defendant's PARAJAN packaging is similar to the Plaintiff's CALPOL packaging. It appears that the Defendant has consciously and slavishly imitated or copied the Plaintiff's CALPOL packaging, including the colour combination, elements of the packaging and placement of tablets, in its entirety. Accordingly, substantial reproduction of the
				Plaintiff's CALPOL packaging is liable to cause confusion in the minds of the consumers. Moreover, the rival packaging used in relation to tablets containing the identical active ingredient, *Paracetamol,* and are both used to treat pain, common cold, headache and fever.

28. Based on the above, the plaintiff seeks *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction against the defendant.

29. Having heard Mr. Urfee Roomi, learned counsel for the plaintiff and having perused the plaint and the documents annexed thereto, it appears that an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction would be in order.

30. The comparative table in para 57 of the plaint and extracted above clearly evidences the deceptive similarity not only between the trademark

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

ZINETAC of the plaintiff and JANTAC mark of the defendant but also the trade dress of all the medicinal preparations enlisted in the said table. It has to be borne in mind that not only are the plaintiff and defendant manufacturing pharmaceutical medicinal preparations in Class-5, the consumer base too would be common. It is also a common knowledge that such medicinal preparations are sold over the counter on prescriptions usually on strips/blister packs. The comparison table evidently demonstrates the confusion that an unwary consumer would be confronted with while purchasing medicinal preparations and would be deceived into believing that the said products are those manufactured by the plaintiff or would associate the products of the defendant to be those of the plaintiff.

31. This Court has also perused the brochures of the products issued by the defendant for its medicinal preparations which also, *prima facie*, display the infringement of trade dress and packaging of the plaintiff. The invoice dated 22.09.2025 also demonstrates that the products of the defendant are available for sale in Delhi. That apart, the medicines also seem to be available on e-commerce websites which are interactive.

32. It would be relevant to consider the Undertaking dated 31.07.2024 executed by Mr. Anand Jain for and on behalf of the defendant. Para nos.5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 of the Undertaking dated 31.07.2024 are extracted hereunder:-

> *"5. I and/or Jankem recognize and acknowledges that GGL has sole and exclusive rights in the marks ZEVIT and ZINETAC (hereinafter referred to as the "GGL Marks"); and the distinctive get-ups and layouts or the packaging or GGL's BETNESOL, ZEVIT, ZINTAC and AUGMENTIN products (hereinafter referred to as the "GGL Packaging") (as shown in Anncxure-1) (the GGL Marks und GGL Packaging are hereinafter collectively referred to as the 'GGL Marks and Packaging');*
>
> *6. I undertake that I and/or Jankem will never, now, or in the future, challenge, or take my action against GGL's rights in the (a) GGL Marks, (b) GGL Packaging, and/or (c) any other marks/packaging that GGL may*

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

adopt in the future on and in relation to its BETNESOL, ZEVIT, ZINETAC, and AUGMENTIN products;

7. I and/or Jankem acknowledge that I/it have/has used, and/or continues to use, pharmaceutical preparations bearing one or more of the marks ZIVHIT and JANTAC (hereinafter referred to as the "Jankem Marks"), and the packaging of the BETAJAN, ZIVHIT, JANTAC and MOXYCROT products as shown in Annexure-II (hereinafter referred to as the "Jankem Packaging"). 'Use', for the purpose of these undertakings, includes, but is not limited to, the manufacture, packaging, marketing, distribution and/or sale, including through Jankem's website, www.jankem.com, and third-party business listing, such as IndiaMart, and social media websites, Facebook, Instagram and X (formerly known as Twitter), etc., as well as use in marketing and promotional materials;

8. By August 31, 2024, I and/or Jankem undertake to cease any and all uses of (a) the Jankem Marks; (b) any marks that incorporate the Jankem Marks; (c) any marks that are identical/deceptively similar to the GGL Marks, whether alone or in conjunction with any other word(s) and/or device(s); (d) the Jankem Packaging; and/or (e) any packaging similar to the GGL Packaging, on and in relation to any medicinal and pharmaceutical products, or any allied/cognate/related goods and/or services, in any manner or form;

9. In the event that I/ and/or Jankem continue to hold onto any goods/materials, bearing (a) the Jankem Marks; (b) any marks that incorporate the Jankem Marks; (c) any marks that are identical/deceptively similar to the GGL Marks, whether alone or in conjunction with any other word(s) and/or device(s); (d) the Jankem Packaging; and/or (e) any packaging similar to the GGL Packaging, I and/or Jankem undertake to destroy any goods/materials, at my own cost, by September 1, 2024, and provide proof of destruction and complete cessation of use, to GGL's Indian counsel, Sujata Chaudhary IP Attorneys, by September 2, 2024. It is understood that cessation of use includes complete destruction of any inventory of finished or unfinished products, and any other materials, such as advertising, promotional and packaging materials, whether or not affixed to finished or unfinished products including packaging, moulds, etc. that are stored/lying at the premises of Jankem, as well as any such goods/materials that are stored/lying at any other premises that are under my or in Jankem's control;

10. I and/or Jankem undertake that, within a period of ten (10) days from the Effective Date, I/Jankem will file, at our own cost, takedown requests, and ensure the takedown of all online listings, including, but not limited to, listings on the website located at www.jankem.com, listings on third-party business listing websites, and listings on social media pages on Facebook, Instagram and X (formerly known as Twitter) bearing reference to bearing (a) the Jankem Marks; (b) any marks that incorporate the Jankem Marks; (c) any marks that are identical/deceptively similar to the GGL Marks,

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

whether alone or in conjunction with any other word(s) and/or device(s); (d) the Jankem Packaging; and/or (e) any packaging similar to the GGL Packaging, and will provide proof of filing/takedown of the listings to GGL's Indian counsel within five (5) working days thereafter;

xxx xxx xxx

13. I and/or Jankem undertake that I and/or Jankem will not, either directly or indirectly, through a related person, entity or otherwise, cause, enable or assist another party to do any of the acts that it is undertaking not to do;"

33. It appears from the records that the defendant is refusing to comply with its own Undertaking dated 31.07.2024 and is continuing to use the mark and packaging deceptively similar to the plaintiff. Even the original artistic works of which the plaintiff would be the owner as per the provisions of the Copyrights Act, 1957 also appear to be, *prima facie,* infringed by the defendant.

34. The plaintiff evidently has a *prima facie* strong case. Having regard to the trademark registrations in favour of the plaintiff and the Undertaking dated 31.07.2024 executed by the defendant, the balance of convenience appears to be tilted in favour of the plaintiff. Irreparable loss and injury which may not be adequately compensated in monetary terms could be suffered by the plaintiff in case immediate *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction is not granted in its favour.

35. In view of the aforesaid, the defendant, any other individuals, officers, managers, employees, agents, dealers, licensees, companies and retailers, stockists, chemists, or any persons/entities that are related or affiliated to the defendant, as the case may be, and all others, acting for and on behalf of the defendant, individually or collectively, are restrained from manufacturing, exporting, offering for sale, selling, displaying, advertising, marketing, whether directly or indirectly, and whether on the Internet or otherwise, ointments, tablets, and any other pharmaceutical and medicinal preparations bearing the defendant's mark and packaging, the defendant's old marks and

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

packaging of, (i) JANTAC ,

; (ii) MOXYCROT
,

; (iii) BETAJAN
,

; (iv) BETAJOX

,

,

;

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

(v) ZIVHIT

; (vi) RANIJOX

;

(vii) PARAJAN
; and/or any other mark or packaging that is identical/deceptively similar to the plaintiff's mark and packaging, (i) ZINETAC

;

(ii) AUGMENTIN

;

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

(iii) CALPOL ; and,

(iv) BETNESOL

.

36. Issue notice.

37. Let a reply to this application be filed by the defendant within four weeks from service. Rejoinder, thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

38. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of CPC shall be done within ten days from date.

CS(COMM) 215/2026

39. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

40. Upon filing of the process fee, issue summons of the suit to the defendant through all permissible modes.

41. The summons shall state that the Written Statement shall be filed by

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04

the defendant within 30 days from the date of the receipt of summons. Alongwith the Written Statement, the defendant shall also file Affidavit of Admission/Denial of the documents of the plaintiff, without which the Written Statement shall not be taken on record.

42. Liberty is granted to the plaintiff to file Replication, if any, within 30 days from the receipt of the Written Statement. Along with the Replication filed by the plaintiff, an Affidavit of Admission/Denial of the documents of defendant be filed by the plaintiff, without which the Replication shall not be taken on record.

43. In case any party is placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession, its details and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

44. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of any documents, the same shall be sought and given within the prescribed timelines.

45. List before the Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 14.05.2026 for completion of service and pleadings.

46. List before the Court on 03.09.2026.

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

MARCH 10, 2026/*kct*

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 11/03/2026 at 18:45:04