

DLST010002752010



**IN THE COURT OF SH. ARUL VARMA,
DISTRICT JUDGE-02, SOUTH DISTRICT, SAKET COURTS
COMPLEX, NEW DELHI**

TM No. 39/2016

Filing No. 18881/2010

CNR No. DLST010002752010

M/s Laboratoire Garnier & CIE

a proprietorship firm

having its office 281, Rue Saint.

Honore, 75008

Paris, France

...Plaintiff

Versus

1. M/s Vijay Stores

Gupta Complex

1st Floor, Railgate

Siliguri, West Bengal

2. The Miscellany

Gupta Complex 1st floor

Room no 4 Alu Patty, 1 No

Siliguri-I

3. M/s Dipali Stores

Sarkar Mention, 1st floor
Near Radha Gobinda Mandir
Siliguri-734001

4. **M/s Anita Trading**

H/N 333/460, Sarkar Manson Building
Seth Srilal Market

5. **M/s Sanjukta**

Near Disco Hotel Ghosh Mansion
127, S.S. Market
Silguri-I

6. **M/s Sanjukta Enterprises**

Behind Bidhan Market Merchant Office
Sarkar Mansion, 1st Floor, Seth Srilal Market
Siliguri-734001

.....**Defendants**

Date of Institution	: 02.06.2010
Date of reserving the judgment	: 14.03.2026
Date of Pronouncement	: 01.04.2026
Decision	: Suit Decreed

JUDGMENT/ORDER

Index to the Judgment

I. BRIEF FACTS/CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF.....	4
II. WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DEFENDANT.....	6
III. ISSUES FRAMED.....	6
IV. APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL COMMISSIONER AND FILING REPORT THEREOF.....	8
V. EVIDENCE LED BY PARTIES.....	8
VI. ARGUMENTS OF COUNSELS FOR THE PARTIES.....	10
VII. ISSUE WISE ANALYSIS & FINDINGS THERETO.....	13
i. <i>Issue no 6: Whether this Court does not have territorial jurisdiction under Section 20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 r/w Section 134 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 to try the present suit?.....</i>	13
ii. <i>Issue no 1: Whether the defendants have infringed the registered trademark of the plaintiff?.....</i>	15
iii. <i>Issue no 2: Whether the defendants have by their acts, passed off their goods as those of the plaintiff, and thus violated the plaintiff's common law rights?.....</i>	15
iv. <i>Issue no 3: Whether the plaintiff is entitled for a decree of permanent injunction as prayed in para (a) of prayer para no 32?.....</i>	15
v. <i>Issue no 4 : Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of delivery of infringing goods of the defendants, finished as well as unfinished?.....</i>	15
vi. <i>Issue no 5: Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of rendition of accounts of the profits gained by defendants as well as unfinished?.....</i>	22
vii. <i>Issue no 7: Whether the plaint has not been instituted by a competent person?.....</i>	22
VIII. RELIEF.....	22

I. BRIEF FACTS/CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF

1. The facts as asseverated by the Plaintiff are hereby succinctly recapitulated: The Plaintiff, a French company, engaged in the business of manufacture, distribution and sale of inter alia hair care, skin care and beauty products under its internationally well known trade mark GARNIER. The Plaintiff has been using the mark and various other stylised labels/word over a long and continuous period of time. The Plaintiff's trade marks are duly registered in India under the Trade Marks Act, 1999. The products of the Plaintiff, and by extension, its trade marks have acquired tremendous reputation and goodwill across the world. The Plaintiff's trade marks/labels have become distinctive, and the world at large identifies, distinguishes and associates the Plaintiff's goods under the said trade marks. It has been emphatically underscored that in view of the Plaintiff's proprietary rights in its trade marks/labels and copyrights, the Plaintiff has the exclusive right to the use thereof to the exclusion of all others.
2. It was brought to the fore, vide the present *lis*, that the Plaintiff discovered that the Defendants were indulging in the sale of counterfeit products by applying the Plaintiff's trade marks on such products, a list whereof was filed with the plaint. Consequently, an ad interim injunction order was obtained from this Court on 03.06.2010 qua the Defendants.

3. Thereafter, Advocates namely Sh Ranjit Chadha, Sh Pulkit Gupta and Sh Amit Bhagat were appointed as Local Commissioners on 03.06.2010 by this Court to visit the premises of the Defendants, who visited and inspected the premises of the Defendants on 16.10.2010, and seized total 10 counterfeit goods from Defendant no 1. It is also a matter of record that Defendant No. 5 and 6 settled the matter with the Plaintiff as reflected in order dated 29.07.2024, suit qua defendant No. 3 was withdrawn vide order dated 12.12.2025, and Defendants No. 1 & 2 were proceeded *ex-parte* vide order dated 16.10.2017 and defendant no 4 was proceeded *ex-parte* on 29.04.2011.
4. It was thus alleged that the defendants have adopted and started using the trade mark in relation to their impugned goods, a mark which is identical with and deceptively similar to the plaintiff's duly registered trade mark in each and every respect including phonetically, visually and structurally. It was also stated that the defendants have also plagiarised the artistic features involved in the plaintiff's said trade mark, and thereby infringed the plaintiff's copyrights as well. It was also averred by the Plaintiff that the actions of the Defendants have resulted in loss of reputation as well losses in business. Hence, the Plaintiff filed the present suit.

II. WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DEFENDANT

5. As per the record, written statements were filed by Defendant No1. The defences were largely common, and the preliminary challenge was to the maintainability of the plaint on account of lack of territorial jurisdiction. The allegations of infringement of trade mark and passing off were also vehemently refuted by the Defendants.

III. ISSUES FRAMED

1. Vide order dated 29.04.2011 following issues were framed:-

“1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for a decree of permanent injunction restraining the defendants by themselves and also through their individual proprietors/partners, agents representatives, distributors, assigns, heirs, successors, stockists and all other acting for and on their behalf from using selling, soliciting, exporting, displaying, advertising or by any other mode or manner dealing in or using the impugned trade mark GARNIER or any other word/mark identical to the plaintiff’s trade mark GARNIER?OPP

2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for a decree for restraining the defendant from disposing off or dealing with their assets their stocks in trade in respect to the infringed trade mark? OPP

3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for delivery of all impugned material, if any, for the purpose of destruction and erasure? OPP

4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for rendition of accounts of profits earned by the defendant by their impugned illegal trade activities ? OPP

5. Relief.”

2. It is pertinent to note that vide order dated 01.04.2019 following further issues were framed:

1. Whether the defendants have infringed the registered trademark of the plaintiff? OPP

2. whether the defendants have by their acts, passed off their goods as those of the plaintiff, and thus violated the plaintiff's common law rights? OPP

3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of permanent injunction as prayed in para (a) of prayer para no 32? OPP

4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of delivery up of infringing goods of the defendants, finished as well as unfinished? OPP

5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of rendition of accounts of the profits gained by defendants on account of sale of the infringing goods? OPP

6. Whether this court does not have territorial jurisdiction under Section 20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 read

with Section 134 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 to try the present suit? OPD

7. *Whether the plaint has not been instituted by a competent person?OPD*
8. *Relief.”*

3. At this juncture, it is to be noted that the issues framed by the order dated 01.04.2019 are more exhaustive, this Court elects to proceed on the basis of the same. Resultantly, the issues previously framed on 29.04.2011 are hereby struck off the record.

IV. APPOINTMENT OF LOCAL COMMISSIONER AND FILING REPORT THEREOF

6. Local Commissioners namely Sh Ranjit Chadha, Sh Pulkit Gupta and Sh Amit Bhagat were appointed on 03.06.2010 who visited and inspected the premises of the Defendants on 16.07.2010, and seized 10 counterfeit goods from Defendant No 1. The Local Commissioner also submitted a report in this regard.

V. EVIDENCE LED BY PARTIES

7. In the proceeding only two witnesses were examined, succinct testimonies whereof are as follows:
8. **PW-1 Mr Pankaj Pahuja:** He tendered his evidence by way of affidavit as Ex. PW1/X. He relied upon following documents:

- (a) Photocopy of extracts from the commercial trade register of France, showing acquisition of the plaintiff company, as Ex. PW1A/1 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark A** (page no. 12 to 19 of affidavit of evidence);
- (b) Photocopy of Power of Attorney dated 25.08.2022, Ex. PW1A/2 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark B**;
- (c) Photocopy of authorization dated 10.06.2021, Ex. PW1A/3 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark C** (page no. 20 & 21);
- (d) Photocopy of some labels of plaintiff's product, Ex. PW1A/4 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark D** (page no. 1 to 7 of list of documents);
- (e) Photocopy of some documents pertaining to registration of its trademarks before Trade Mark Registry, Ex. PW1A/5 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark E** (page no. 12 to 22 of list of documents);
- (f) Photocopy of list of registration of trademark GARNIER in different countries, Ex. PW1A/6 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark F** (page no. 9 to 11 of list of documents);
- (g) Photocopies of sales invoices, Ex. PW1A/7 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark G** (page no. 23 to 31 of list of documents);
- (h) Photocopies of advertisement by plaintiff company, Ex. PW1A/8 (de-exhibited) and **Mark H** (page no. 35 to 39 of list of documents);
- (i) Photocopy of extracts of plaintiff's website, Ex. PW1A/9 (de-exhibited) and as **Mark I** (page no. 32 to 34 of list of documents);

- (j) Photocopy of MOU and AOU between plaintiff and its group company Loreal India Pvt. Ltd., Ex. PW1A/10 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark J** (page no. 41 to 70 of list of documents);
- (k) Photocopy of license agreement between plaintiff and Loreal India Pvt. Ltd., Ex. PW1A/11 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark K** (page no. 1 to 11 of list of documents dated 06.07.2011);
- (l) Photocopies of invoices with its entity Anand Enterprises, Ex. PW1A/12 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark L** (page no. 12 to 22 of list of documents dated 06.07.2011)
- (m) photocopies of invoices with its entity Nav Bharat Enterprises, Ex. PW1A/13 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark M** (page no. 25 to 34 of list of documents dated 06.07.2011);
- (n) Photocopy of specimens of defendants' product bearing the impugned trademark, Ex. PW1A/14 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark N** (page no. 8 to 8C of list of documents);
- (o) LC Report, Ex. PW1A/15;
- (p) Photocopies of orders passed by various courts in favour of plaintiff, Ex. PW1A/16 (de-exhibited) and marked as **Mark O** (page no. 71 to 111 of list of documents).

VI. ARGUMENTS OF COUNSELS FOR THE PARTIES

9. Qua the aspect of territorial jurisdiction, Ld Counsel for the plaintiff submitted that in terms of Section 134 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 this Court has the requisite territorial jurisdiction to try and entertain the present suit inasmuch as

the plaintiff carries on business within the jurisdiction of South Delhi.

10.Ld Counsel for the plaintiff further contended that keeping in view the plaintiff’s proprietary rights in its trademarks/labels, its goodwill and reputation, and its copyrights, the plaintiff has the exclusive rights to use the same and the defendants or anyone else cannot be permitted to use the same in any manner whatsoever without the leave of the plaintiff. It has been argued that the defendants were involved in sale of counterfeit products by applying the plaintiff’s trade-mark on such impugned products. During the course of arguments, Ld Counsel for plaintiff had furnished a comparison chart (Table 1) to illustrate that the defendants were indulging in dealing with counterfeit products of the plaintiff.

TABLE-I

PLAINTIFF’S GOODS	DEFENDANT’S GOODS
	



It was further contended that a Local Commissioner was appointed by this Court on 03.06.2010, who visited and inspected the premises of the defendants, and seized counterfeit goods from the defendants. The Local Commissioner also submitted a report in this regard, and it was the contention of Ld Counsel for plaintiff that the report of the Local Commissioner be treated as evidence in a suit which is not challenged by any party.

11. It was further contended that the defendants, although had appeared in the beginning of the proceedings, however due to their subsequent non appearance, they were proceeded *ex-parte*. It was submitted that since the assertions of the plaintiff have gone un rebutted, the assertions are to be deemed to be admitted, and therefore the suit ought to be decreed in favour

of the plaintiff. Ld Counsel for the plaintiff also brought to the fore that the plaintiff had foregone the relief of damages in the present suit.

12. Thus, it was contended that the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their proprietors, officers, servants, agents, distributors, stockists, representatives and anyone acting for or on their behalf, from manufacturing, selling and/or offering for sale, advertising, directly or indirectly dealing in any products bearing the trade-mark of the plaintiff or any other mark similar or identical thereto, amounting to passing of or infringement of plaintiff's registered trade marks or copyright.

VII. ISSUE WISE ANALYSIS & FINDINGS THERETO

- i. *Issue no 6: Whether this Court does not have territorial jurisdiction under Section 20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 r/w Section 134 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 to try the present suit?*

13. In the written statement, the defendants had challenged the territorial jurisdiction of this court to try and entertain the present suit. To adjudicate upon this issue, it would be apposite to advert to Sections 134 of the Trade Marks Act and Section 20 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. Section 20 CPC confers jurisdiction at a place inter alia where a defendant resides or carries on business. It is Section 134 of the Trade Marks Act that expands the aforementioned

jurisdiction to a place where even the *plaintiff* actually or voluntarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain.

14. In a case akin to the present one, where a composite suit for infringement of trade mark as well as for passing off was filed, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dealing with the aspect of jurisdiction, observed in the matter of *Indian Performing Rights Society Limited v Sanjay Dalia (2015) 10 SCC 161* as thus:

"47. In our opinion, the provisions of section 62 of the Copyright Act and section 134 of the Trade Marks Act have to be interpreted in the purposive manner. No doubt about it that a suit can be filed by the plaintiff at a place where he is residing or carrying on business or personally works for gain. He need not travel to file a suit to a place where defendant is residing or cause of action wholly or in part arises. However, if the plaintiff is residing or carrying on business etc. at a place where cause of action, wholly or in part, has also arisen, he has to file a suit at that place, as discussed above."

15. Further, to buttress his claim qua territorial jurisdiction, the Plaintiff had placed reliance on Mark G viz. Invoice of Sale of products of the goods of the Plaintiff in Green Park Extension, South Delhi. The said invoice has been issued by inter alia R.S Marketing Co. who is stated to be authorised distributor of the products of the Plaintiff. The address of this distributor, as contained in the invoice, make it explicit that the address is of South Delhi. It is thus pellucid that the

Plaintiff was carrying on business in South Delhi, thereby vesting this Court with the requisite territorial jurisdiction to try and entertain the present suit. Accordingly, the issue at hand is decided in favour of the Plaintiff and against the defendants.

ii. Issue no 1: *Whether the defendants have infringed the registered trademark of the plaintiff?*

iii. Issue no 2: *Whether the defendants have by their acts, passed off their goods as those of the plaintiff, and thus violated the plaintiff's common law rights?*

iv. Issue no 3: *Whether the plaintiff is entitled for a decree of permanent injunction as prayed in para (a) of prayer para no 32?*

v. Issue no 4 : *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of delivery of infringing goods of the defendants, finished as well as unfinished?*

16. The above four issues are being dealt with collectively.

REGISTRATION OF TRADE MARK

17. At the first instance, the Plaintiff is required to establish its proprietary rights qua the trade marks in question. The Plaintiff examined PW-1 Sh Pankaj Ahuja. The said witness predicated the factum of registration of trade mark by producing and proving the documents pertaining to

registration of its trademark before Trade Mark Registry as Mark E and list of registration of trademark GARNIER in different countries as Mark F. It is to be borne in mind that in a matter pertaining to infringement of a trade mark, the Court has to peruse either the Legal Proceeding Certificate (LPC) or Registration Certificate along with the extract from the Journal, in order to ascertain whether the trade mark has been registered or not. The LPC would reflect the mark, the date of application, date of user claimed, conditions and disclaimers any, assignments and licenses granted, renewals etc.(see *Amrish Agarwal v M/s Venus Home Appliances Pvt Ltd 2019 SCC OnLine Del 9966*). The testimony of PW1 and the documents proved by him viz. Mark E and Mark F i.e. Documents pertaining to registration of its trademark before Trade Mark Registry and list of registration of trademark GARNIER in different countries respectively also would make it abundantly explicit that the Plaintiff had its trade marks inter alia GARNIER duly registered.

EFFECT OF REGISTRATION

18. Thus, a right accrued in the Plaintiff to institute a suit for injunction to restrain the Defendants from manufacturing, storing and selling the counterfeit products bearing its trade mark. Section 28 of the Trademarks Act, 1999 clarifies that the valid registration of a trademark shall confer on the

registered owner of the trademark exclusive right to use the trademark in relation to the goods or services in respect of which the trademark is registered. The Section further empowers the owner of the trademark to obtain relief in respect of infringement of trademark in the matter provided under the Act. Section 134 of the Act provides the remedy of filing a suit for infringement of a trademark while Section 135 of the Act describes the relief which may be granted in a suit for infringement or passing off the trademark.

INFRINGEMENT

19. Section 29 of the Act defines the meaning of infringement of a registered trademark. It provides that a registered trademark is infringed by a person, who, not being a registered proprietor or a person using by way of permitted use, uses in the course of trade, a mark which is identical with or deceptively similar to, the trademark in relation to goods or services in respect of which the trademark is registered and in such manner as to render the use of the mark likely to be taken as being used as a trademark. Sub-Section (2) of Section 29 of the Act further clarifies that a trademark is infringed by using a mark which is identical or similar with the registered trademark to an extent that it is likely to cause confusion on the part of public that it has an association with the registered trademark. Sub-Section (3) of Section 29 of the

Act provides a presumption in respect of a marks that is likely to create confusion on the part of the public on account of its identity with the registered trademark and the identity of goods or services covered by such registered trademark.

20. In *Renaissance Hotel Holdings Inc. v. B. Vijaya Sai, (2022) 5 SCC 1*, the law qua infringement was expounded as thus:

““The legislative scheme is clear that when the mark of the defendant is identical with the registered trade mark of the plaintiff and the goods or services covered are similar to the ones covered by such registered trade mark, it may be necessary to prove that it is likely to cause confusion on the part of the public, or which is likely to have an association with the registered trade mark. Similarly, when the trade mark of the plaintiff is similar to the registered trade mark of the defendant and the goods or services covered by such registered trade mark are identical or similar to the goods or services covered by such registered trade mark, it may again be necessary to establish that it is likely to cause confusion on the part of the public. However, when the trade mark of the defendant is identical with the registered trade mark of the plaintiff and that the goods or services of the defendant are identical with the goods or services covered by registered trade mark, the Court shall presume that it is likely to cause confusion on the part of the public”

21. The likelihood of confusion or deception amongst the consuming public is a *sine qua non* element in an action for infringement or passing off. The onus would be on the plaintiff to establish that the trade mark used by the defendant in the course of trade in the goods in respect of which its mark is registered, is deceptively similar. The degree of

deception cannot be established by laying down any objective standards.

22. The deception has necessarily to be ascertained by a comparison of the two marks. The resemblance may be phonetic, visual or in the basic idea represented by the plaintiff's mark. (see *Pernod Ricard India Pvt Ltd. v Karanveer Singh Chhabra 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1701*) The purpose of the comparison is for determining whether the essential features of the plaintiff's trade mark are to be found in that used by the defendant.

23. Moreover, there are allegations of the defendants dealing with counterfeit goods of the plaintiff. In this context, it would be apposite to peruse the following extracts of *Puma Se v Mahesh Kumar 2025 SCC OnLine Del 1458*:

“Any goods or products, that are identical to such a degree, in the manner of appearance, for an identical business, with an identical customer base, wherein it falls under the category of counterfeit, will unquestionably cause confusion and deception in the eyes of the public. Further, it has been succinctly observed, that “Counterfeiting is ‘hard core’ or ‘first degree’ trademark infringement and the most blatant and egregious form of ‘passing off’.” (See : 4 J. Thomas McCarthy, McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition § 25.10 (4th ed. 2008)). Thus, it stands established that the defendant is infringing upon the rights of the plaintiff under their well-known and registered marks, by engaging in the blatant act of counterfeiting”

24. Now, coming to the aspect whether defendants have infringed the trademark of the plaintiff. In the present matter, there is irrefutable evidence to show that huge quantity of counterfeit products bearing the trade mark of the plaintiff were recovered from the possession of the defendants. Photographs of the recovered counterfeit products were taken by the Local Commissioner and copies of the same were filed along with the report. This Court has perused the same. The photographs show that defendants has used almost identical mark (GARNIER on the counterfeit goods recovered from his possession. The mark (GARNIER) was affixed on the each products, which falls under the category of the same goods which are being manufactured by the plaintiff. Thus, defendants not only used the identical mark (GARNIER) but also used the mark in respect of identical goods (like eye liner, mascara, shampoo, creams etc.) which are being sold by the plaintiff. The products recovered from the possession of defendants were certainly meant to be sold in the market for profit. There is thus indisputable evidence to establish that defendants had been using a mark exactly identical to the registered trademark of the plaintiff. Further, the Local Commissioner has also corroborated the version of plaintiff regarding infringement of registered trademark of plaintiff, by the defendants.

25. This Court has also perused the comparison chart of the goods of the plaintiff as well as the defendants as illustrated in Table-I. A close scrutiny thereof, specifically the defendants choice of typography for these marks, coupled with adoption of a trade dress identical to that of the plaintiff's products, leads to an inference of the goods of the defendants being counterfeit. The trade mark GARNIER has a distinct letter i.e. 'e' which is in small letters although the font is large, and this mark has been blatantly and brazenly copied by the defendants. The similarity is pronounced. Despite the lawful registration of the trade marks of the Plaintiff, the defendants employed these marks in respect of identical goods as the plaintiff's, thereby leaving no opportunity to the hoi polloi, the consumers, to make a discernment, or an informed choice.

26. The defendants' action therefore exhibit a *mala fide* intent to leverage the established market presence of the plaintiff's products to their own advantage. There is irrefragable evidence on record to demonstrate that the Defendants have taken advantage of the Plaintiff's ingenuity, and have infringed the trade mark of the Plaintiff with impunity, and have nonchalantly sold off their counterfeit goods in the market to credulous buyers. Such knavery cannot be brooked. The issues are therefore decided in favour of the plaintiff.

vi. Issue no 5: *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of rendition of accounts of the profits gained by defendants as well as unfinished?*

27. The said issue was not pressed by the plaintiff at the time of final arguments, and thus the plaintiff is not entitled for rendition of account of defendants pertaining to the sale of goods under the trade mark of the plaintiff.

vii. Issue no 7: *Whether the plaint has not been instituted by a competent person?*

28. The onus to prove this issue was on the defendants. However, defendants never appeared before this Court to prove that the plaint has not been instituted by a competent person and therefore they were proceeded *ex-parte*. Since defendant could not prove that the plaint has not been instituted by a competent person, this issue is decided against the defendants and in favour of plaintiff.

VIII. RELIEF.

29. Ergo, in view of the above *in extenso* discussion, the suit stands decreed in favour of the plaintiff with the following relief:

(a) A decree of permanent injunction against the defendants whereby the defendants, their proprietors, officers, servants, agents, distributors, stockists, representatives and

anyone acting for or on their behalf, from manufacturing, selling and/or offering for sale, advertising, directly or indirectly dealing in any products bearing the trade-mark of the plaintiff or any other mark similar or identical thereto, amounting to passing of or infringement of plaintiff's registered trade marks or copyright.

(b) The seized counterfeit products shall be delivered to the plaintiff for destruction.

30. Decree sheet be prepared accordingly.
31. No order as to costs.
32. File be consigned to record room after necessary compliance.

Pronounced in the open Court
on this 01st April, 2026

(ARUL VARMA)
DISTRICT JUDGE-02/SOUTH,
SAKET COURTS/NEW DELHI