



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION  
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION

**INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 13639 OF 2026**  
**IN**  
**COMMERCIAL IP SUIT (L) NO. 12187 OF 2026**

DBS Bank India Ltd. ... Applicant/Plaintiff.

**Versus**

John Doe(s)/Ashok Kumar(s) and Ors. ... Respondents/Defendants.

---

*Dr. Birendra Saraf, Senior Advocate a/w. Rohan Savant, Monisha Mane Bhangale, Bijal Vora, Tamanna Meghrajani, P.R. Hariharan i/by Parinam Law Associates for the Plaintiff.*

*Mr Rishabh Jaisani a/w. Ameer Rana, Nitya Chowdhary i/by Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas for the Defendant No.2.*

*Mr. Vivek Reddy, Senior Advocate (through VC) a/w. Swati Agarwal, Harti Lakhani, Shashank Mishra, Vaarish Sawlani, Vedika Rathore, Abhishek Mookherjee, Suvaroop Saha Roy, Pival Peddireddi i/by Shardul Amarchand Mangaldas for Defendant No.3.*

---

**Coram : Sharmila U. Deshmukh, J.**

**Date : April 21, 2026**

**P.C. :**

1. The suit has been filed by the Plaintiff seeking an order of permanent injunction against the Defendant No.1, which is John Doe action from passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting the Plaintiff's corporate name being "DBS Bank India Limited" or any part thereof and/or passing off any other corporate name identical and/or deceptively similar to that of the

Plaintiff's corporate name in any medium whatsoever and for mandatory injunction against the Defendant Nos.2 and 3, who are intermediaries to remove/delete/take down/disable the dubious profiles and/or social media groups and/or contents that are passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting the Plaintiff's corporate name, for disclosure, and, for an order of mandatory injunction directing the Defendant No.4 to suspend/block the domain name of the fake websites and for damages.

**2.** By way of the present Interim Application, the Plaintiff seeks interim relief against the Defendant Nos.1, 3 and 4.

**3.** It is submitted that the Plaintiff i.e. DBS Bank India Limited is an unlisted public company providing banking and financial services under DBS group in India. The plaint sets out the achievements of the Plaintiff Bank as well as the extensive goodwill and reputation which is embodied in its extensive physical and digital network, its large and loyal base of retail, SME and Corporate clients and its recognition and trusted banking institution in India.

**4.** Dr. Saraf, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the Plaintiff would submit that the Plaintiff has been the subject of coordinated campaign of impersonation and financial fraud whereby unknown individuals are systematically misusing the Plaintiff's corporate

name and the identities of its official to deceive the members of the public. He submits that certain unidentified individuals are falsely misrepresenting themselves as the Plaintiff's representatives/employees and are reaching out to the potential victims via phone as well as the Defendant Nos.3's platform-Whatsapp. He submits that the *modus operandi* adopted by the dubious groups formed on Whatsapp direct the victims to fraudulent websites and mobile app inducing them to invest on basis of forged identity and SEBI broker certificate to feign legitimacy.

5. He submits that on 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2024, it was brought to the Plaintiff's attention that an individual purporting to be an investment assistant of the Plaintiff had contacted one Deepak Hargude on phone and instructed him to access the URL containing the name "India DBS" via Defendant No.3's platform and to make investment as recommended. He submits that false identity proof of DBS official, a false certificate of incorporation of the Plaintiff and the fake SEBI issued stock broker certificate was part of the Whatsapp communication and believing in the misrepresentation the victim proceeded to make an investment of about Rs.11 lakhs in an account name 'DBS Securities Foreign Investment Account'. He

submits that a similar complaint was received on 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2025 via email from one Nitin Bhor seeking confirmation whether the Plaintiff operates or authorises services through the website bearing the name “dbsbank.com”.

6. He would further submit that on 5<sup>th</sup> January, 2025, a complaint was received from one Mr. Vinay Kumar alleging that an amount of Rs.10,20,000/- was invested which had reportedly accrued profits totaling Rs.63,00,000/-. He submits that a formal complaint was lodged by Vinay Kumar with the Cyber Cell after being informed that the investment was not made through the Plaintiff’s legitimate channel. He would further submit that there have been complaints lodged with the National Stock Exchange of India alleging that the general public is being contacted by certain individuals purporting to be the officials of the Plaintiff and inducing the victims to invest through Whatsapp groups claiming to be the official channel of the Plaintiff.

7. He would submit that the Whatsapp group *inter alia* operates under a deceptive name by including the Plaintiff’s trade name “DBS” in order to misrepresent to the general public that these Whatsapp groups are formed through the Plaintiff’s legitimate channel and are passing off their fraudulent services such as

courses on financial planning, investment as emanating from the Plaintiff including the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and Managing Director Mr. Rajat Varma. He would point out to the material appended to the application showing the contents of such Whatsapp group which uses the Plaintiff's trade name "DBS" and the profile of their CEO. He has taken this Court painstakingly through several documents annexed to the Interim Application demonstrating the misrepresentation by such Whatsapp groups impersonating Mr. Rajat Varma purportedly offering free stock market guidance. He would submit that such cyber fraud activities have resulted in an unfortunate incident of a retired police officer attempting suicide after having been duped of Rs.8 Crores through a Whatsapp group bearing the trade name of the Plaintiff's i.e. DBS. He submits that the gravity of the issue was highlighted by the NSE in its email communication stating that necessary action be taken and the matter be taken up with the concerned social media platforms for necessary action.

**8.** He would point out the forged SEBI registration certificate and the certificate of incorporation purportedly in the name of the Plaintiff's bank which is being misused by the fraudsters to induce the general public to invest. He submits that the acts initiated

through such Whatsapp groups constitutes passing off their services as that emanating from the Plaintiff with serious consequences. He submits that in the past, this Court upon such activities being brought to the notice of the Court have passed appropriate interim reliefs.

9. He would further submit that by the Interim Application, the Plaintiff only seeks compliance with the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 and has taken this Court through the various Rules and would contend that the Rules itself contemplate due diligence by the intermediaries and as the same was found missing, the Plaintiff is required to approach the Court. In support, he relies upon the following decisions:

- (i) National Stock Exchange of India Ltd. vs. Meta Platforms INC & Ors.<sup>1</sup>,**
- (ii) HDFC Life Insurance Company Ltd. Vs. Meta Platforms INC & Ors.<sup>2</sup>**
- (iii) Living Media India Ltd. & Anr. vs. Aabtak Channel Com (John Does) & Ors.<sup>3</sup>**
- (iv) Zepto Pvt.Ltd. and Anr. v. Owner of Domain Name Zeptonowindia.com & Ors.<sup>4</sup>**

---

1 Dated 8<sup>th</sup> May, 2025 passed in IA(L)No.21456 of 2024 in COMIP(L) No. 21111 of 2024

2 Decision passed in IA(L)No.1108 of 2025 in COMIP No.177 of 2025

3 Decision dated 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2022 in IA(L)No.193 of 2022 & I.A.s. 4841-43 of 2022

4 (2025) SCC OnLine Del 5767

- (v) **Tata Sons Pvt.Ltd. & Anr. vs. John Doe**<sup>5</sup>
- (vi) **HDFC Life Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Meta Paltforms In. & Ors.**<sup>6</sup>
- (vii) **HDFC Life Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Meta Paltforms Inc & Ors.**<sup>7</sup>
- (viii) **National Stock Exchange of India Ltd. vs. Meta Platforms INC & Ors.**<sup>8</sup>
- (ix) **National Stock Exchange vs. John Doe (s) & Ors.**<sup>9</sup>,
- (x) **X v. Union of India**<sup>10</sup>
- (xi) **Aaradhya Bachchan v. Bollywood Time**<sup>11</sup>
- (xii) **UTI Infrastructure Technology & Services Ltd. v. Extra Tech World**<sup>12</sup>.

**10.** The objection raised by Mr. Reddy, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the Defendant No.3 stems from the fact that the Whatsapp messages are end-to-end encrypted and it is not possible for Whatsapp to view the contents of the Whatsapp messages. He submits that the manner in which the Whatsapp operates is different from the other social media platforms such as Facebook and YouTube, as it is possible for the other social media platforms to delete the particular infringing content. He submits that upon action being taken by Defendant No.3 of blocking/removing or deleting of the account, the entire content gets deleted and not

---

5 (2025) SCC OnLine Del 5733

6 Decision dated 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2024 in COMIP Suit (L)No.35837 of 2024.

7 Decision dated 8th May, 2025 in COMIP Suit No.177 of 2025

8 Decision dated 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2024 in COMIP Suit(L)No.21111 of 2024

9 Decision dated 10th April, 2026 in COMIP(L) No. 9452 of 2026

10 (2023), 3 HCC (Del) 63

11 (2023) 6 HCC (Del) 727

12 2024 SCC OnLine Bom 3646

merely the infringing contents. He submits that in the past Whatsapp has faced several litigation by reason of blocking of the accounts of individuals. He submits that the present litigation is not adversarial, however, there cannot be any blanket injunction granted to block the entire account on the mere say of the Plaintiff.

**11.** He submits that there cannot be any dispute about complying with the Intermediary Rules. He submits that therefore, it would be in the interest of all the parties, if the Plaintiff identifies the specific group and seeks specific directions *qua* the specific group on case to case basis instead of seeking blanket interim order of the Whatsapp groups being blocked/removed/deleted upon being informed of the same by the Plaintiff. He submits that in the past, the Courts have acknowledged that though approaching the Court on every occasion would be a cumbersome exercise, it cannot be avoided. He submits that as done in the past, the Courts can do away with the requirement of formal interim application and an affidavit can be filed only for the purpose of identifying the specific Whatsapp group and taking specific order in that respect. In support, he relies upon the following decisions.

**(i) *Bundl Technologies (P) Ltd. v. Aanit Awattam*<sup>13</sup>,**

**(ii) *Hindustan Unilever v. Endurance Domains Technology***

---

<sup>13</sup> 2023 SCC OnLine Bom 227

- LLP.<sup>14</sup>,**
- (iii) HDFC Life Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Meta Platforms Inc. & Ors.<sup>15</sup>,**
- (iv) UTV Software Communication Ltd. v. 1337X.To and Ors.,<sup>16</sup>,**
- (v) Star India Private Limited & Anr. v. Haneeth Ujwal and Ors.,<sup>17</sup>,**
- (vi) Lee Entertainment Enterprises Ltd. v. Tejendra Modi & Ors.,<sup>18</sup>,**
- (vii) KRBL Limited v. John Doe & Ors.,<sup>19</sup>,**
- (viii) Jainemo Private Limited v. Rahul Shah & Ors.,<sup>20</sup>,**
- (ix) 360 One WAM Limited v. John Doe & Ors.,<sup>21</sup>,**
- (x) Master Capital Services Limited & Anr. v. John Doe & Ors.,<sup>22</sup>,**
- (xi) RKS V Securities India Pvt. Ltd. v. John Does & Ors.<sup>23</sup>,**
- (xii) Niva Bupa Health Insurance Company Limited V. Telegram FZ-LLC & Ors.,<sup>24</sup>,**
- (xiii) Axis Max Life Insurance Limited v. Union of India & Ors.,<sup>25</sup>,**
- (xiv) National Stock Exchange of India Ltd. v. Meta Platforms Inc & Ors.,<sup>26</sup>,**

**12.** I have gone through the various decisions which have been cited across the bar, considered the submissions and perused the record.

**13.** In essence what the Plaintiff seeks is an interim injunction

14 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 809

15 Decision dated May 8, 2025 in COMIP Suit No.117 of 2025

16 2019 SCC OnLine Del 8002

17 2014 SCC OnLine Del 3837

18 Decision dated 1 June 2021 in CS (COMM) No.231 of 2021

19 Decision dated July 28, 2025 in CS (COMM) No.416/2024

20 Decision dated October 28, 2024 in CS (COMM.) No.676/2023

21 Decision dated March 7, 2026 in COM(IP) No.47 of 2026

22 Decision dated May 15, 2025 in CS(COMM) No.832/2024,

23 Decision dated August 8, 2025 in CS (COMM) No.1215/2025,

24 Decision dated May 1, 2025 in CS(COMM.) No.1089 of 2024,

25 Decision dated September, 3, 2025 in CS(COMM.)No.666 of 2025

26 Decision dated May 8, 2025 in COM IP Suit (L)No.21111 of 20024

against a passing off action by reason of identified/unidentified Whatsapp groups impersonating the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials misrepresenting to the general public of an association with the Plaintiff and passing off the investment tips/financial advice/stock market analysis as emanating from the Plaintiff. The consequences of such an action can have a grave impact as the gullible public is induced in believing that these financial/investment advice emanates from the Plaintiff which is a well known banking network having about 490 branches across more than 350 locations and providing services to a vast consumer base.

**14.** Dr. Saraf has pointed out the infringing Whatsapp content which is circulated through Whatsapp groups misusing the Plaintiff's trade name DBS and using the profile of the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and providing stock market tips. In order to secure the trust of the unsuspecting victims the fraudsters are not only misusing the trade name of the Plaintiff but have created forged employee identity cards, SEBI registrations and certificate of incorporation of the Plaintiff.

**15.** The submission of Mr. Reddy is not to obstruct the grant of any relief by this Court, considering the gravity of the matter which

would have a huge impact on the society, if despite bring brought to the notice of this Court the infringing activities are permitted to continue. The Defendant No.3 only seeks that the interim reliefs which would be granted should be in consonance with the Intermediary Rules.

**16.** The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 was enacted in exercise of powers under Section 87 of the Information Technology Act, 2000. The Rules defines the social media intermediary and there is no dispute about the fact that the Defendant Nos.2 and 3 are intermediaries. Part II of the Intermediary Rules governs the aspect of due diligence by Intermediaries and Grievance Redressal Mechanism. Rule 3(1) provides that an intermediary, including a social media intermediary, a significant social media intermediary and an online gaming intermediary, shall observe the following due diligence while discharging its duties, and the sub clauses thereof set out the aspect of due diligence. In particular, clause (b) provides that the intermediary shall make reasonable efforts by itself, and to cause the users of its computer resource to not host display, upload, modify, publish, transmit, store, update or share any information that belongs to another person and to which the user

does not have any right, infringes any patent, trademark, copyright or other proprietary rights, deceives or misleads the addressee about the origin of the message or knowingly and intentionally communicates any misinformation or information which is patently false and untrue or misleading in nature, or in respect of any business of the Central Government, is identified as fake or false or misleading by such fact check unit of the Central Government as the Ministry may, by notification published in the Official Gazette, specify, or impersonates any person, or violates any law for the time being in force. The duty is therefore cast upon the intermediaries to take all reasonable efforts by itself to ensure compliance with the duties which are set out in Rule 3.

**17.** Mr. Reddy would point out Rule 3(1)(d) of the Intermediary Rules which provides that any information which violates any law is hosted on the social media platform, upon receiving the actual knowledge under Section 79 of the Act, such information is to be removed or access to such information is to be disabled within three hours of receipt of actual knowledge. He submits that the Rules specifically provides that such actual knowledge shall arise only by an order of the Court of competent jurisdiction or by a reasoned intimation by authorised officer of the appropriate

Government or its agency. He would submit that the Defendant No.3-Whatsapp only seeks compliance of Rule 3(1)(d) by asking for an order in respect of a specific Whastapp group instead of a blanket injunction for future links to be communicated by the Plaintiff.

**18.** The said contention overlooks the Grievance Redressal Mechanism of intermediary which is set out in Rule 3(2), which provides for the mechanism by which a user or victim may make a complaint with the Grievance Officer, who shall acknowledge the complaint within twenty-four hours and resolve such complaint within a period of seven days from the date of its receipt and where the complaint in a nature of request for removal of information or communication link relating to clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 3, except sub-clauses (i) and (iv) and (xi), shall be acted upon and resolved within thirty-six hours of such reporting. The said Rule also provides that appropriate safeguards may be developed by the intermediary to avoid any misuse by users. It is therefore, unacceptable that the intermediary can act only if there is an order of Court of competent jurisdiction in respect of a specified group. The Rules provide for a mechanism under which upon such information being received, the intermediary can on its own act on

the complaint and take corrective measure.

**19.** It has also been pointed out by Dr. Saraf that after certain links were communicated, the Defendant No.3 had in fact removed the links before an order of this Court can be passed. The same implies that it is open for the intermediary to take corrective action upon receiving information through its Grievance Redressal Mechanism. Though the Grievance Redressal Mechanism gives a time limit of 7 days, in respect of a complaint which is the subject matter of the present application, the Rules itself provide that the same shall be resolved within 36 hours from such reporting. It is necessary for the intermediaries to take proactive steps and set up a Grievance Redressal Mechanism to safeguard against fraudulent activities and in such cases, time is of essence as delayed reaction is likely to cause irreversible loss to the victims.

**20.** The Courts, in the past, in the case of National Stock Exchange of India and HDFC Life Insurance Company Limited have granted identical reliefs and have safeguarded the intermediaries by incorporating an additional duty on the Plaintiff to provide evidence in the form of screen shots showing circulation of infringing contents by the accounts/groups and identifying such contents/accounts/groups. The Courts have further granted liberty

to the intermediaries to require the Plaintiff to obtain the appropriate directions from the Court for disabling such infringing contents which do not fall within the ambit of the order. Though the order, which was passed in the case of NSE, was stated not to be treated as a precedent, in the present case, even if the orders are not treated as precedent, identical facts arise in the present case and on consideration of the facts and upon perusal of the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that there is necessity for granting interim relief against such passing off action.

**21.** It needs no reiteration that in today's era of advanced information technology, the advantages have also brought along with it, the risk of misuse of the information technology by fraudsters. The reach of the social media platforms is vast and speedy which emphasizes the need to take immediate corrective action upon any such infringing, fraudulent activity being brought to the notice of the intermediaries. Even accepting that the action of the Defendant No.3 would result in blocking the entire accounts, the Intermediary Rules itself enjoins the intermediary to take all reasonable efforts by itself to ensure that the users of its computer resource do not upload or disseminate any information which infringes other's rights or impersonates another person or

communicates any misinformation. The Plaintiff in the present case by way of the interim relief is seeking to enforce the due diligence which is even otherwise mandated by the Intermediary Rules to which there cannot be any objection. It is not necessary for this Court to deal with the various decisions cited by both the parties particularly considering the fair stand which has been taken by Mr. Reddy that compliance with the Intermediary Rules is non-negotiable.

**22.** This Court does not consider it necessary to follow the course of filing an interim application or affidavit for the purpose of seeking interim relief on a case to case basis upon future links being identified as the relief sought by the Plaintiff under prayer Clause (c) ii of the Interim Application is in consonance with the Grievance Redressal Mechanism which is set out in the Intermediary Rules.

**23.** Dr. Saraf would submit that the Defendant No.2 was impleaded only by reason of being in control of Defendant No.3 and as of date restricts its interim relief only against Defendant No.1 which is John Doe, Defendant No.3 which is Whatsapp and Defendant No.4 which is a Domain Registrar. Insofar as the Defendant No.4 is concerned, the relief which has been sought is to

suspend/block the domain name of the fake websites which are passing off the Plaintiffs corporate name bearing DBS India Limited unauthorisedly claiming the services to be originating from the Plaintiff, which fake website misuses the Plaintiff's corporate name to sustain a coordinated campaign of impersonation and financial fraud.

**24.** In light of the above, the Interim Application is allowed against the Defendant Nos.1, 3 and 4 in terms of prayer clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f), which reads as under:

"a) Restrain Defendant No. 1, their directors/ proprietor/ partners, their principals, employees, agents, distributors, franchisees, representatives, assignees and or any other person claiming through them from passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting the Plaintiff's Corporate Name being "DBS Bank India Limited" and/or any part thereof and/or any abbreviation or variation thereof and/or passing off any other corporate name identical and/or deceptively similar name to the Plaintiff's Corporate Name or of any like nature in any medium/form including television, print media and/or the internet and/or in any manner whatsoever.

b) Restrain Defendant No. 1, their directors/ proprietor/ partners, their principals, employees, agents, distributors, franchisees, representatives, assignees and/ or any other person claiming through them from passing off any goods or services unauthorizedly claiming to be

originating from or endorsed by the Plaintiff and/or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials and/or impersonating the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials for providing any investment/financial advice/stock market analysis and further restraining Defendant Nos. 1 from unauthorizedly misrepresenting to any person that they or their business activities have any association with the Plaintiff and/ or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials on any medium and in any manner whatsoever;

- c) Direct Defendant Nos. 2 and 3, their directors/ proprietor/ partners, their principals, employees, agents, distributors, franchisees, representatives and assigns to: act within the timelines envisaged under the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 ("IT Rules 2021"), of receiving complaint from the Plaintiff and accordingly:
  - i. Remove/ delete/ take down/ disable the dubious profiles and/or social media groups and/or accounts and/or administrators of such social media groups, more particularly mentioned in paragraph 16 and Exhibit "G" hereto, on the domains and/ or websites and/or social media platforms owned, operated and controlled by Defendant Nos. 2 and 3 within one week from the date of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court;
  - ii. Remove/ delete/ take down/ disable the dubious profiles and/or social media groups and/accounts of administrators of social media groups and/or content that are passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting Plaintiff's Corporate Name being "DBS Bank India Limited" and/or any part thereof and/or abbreviation or variation thereof and/or

impersonating the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials for providing any investment/financial advice/stock market analysis and/or using any corporate name identical and/or deceptively similar to the Plaintiff's Corporate Name and/or unauthorizedly claiming any goods or services to be originating from the Plaintiff and/or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials within the timelines as envisaged under IT Rules, 2021, provided that the Plaintiff gives an undertaking that the Plaintiff and/or its officers have not prepared/circulated/published/approved the content/ post/ social media groups on the domains and/ or websites and/or social media platforms owned, operated and controlled by Defendant Nos. 2 & 3, on being informed of the same by the Plaintiff through its email address [customercareindia@dbs.com](mailto:customercareindia@dbs.com) by providing the following information/documents and subject to right of Defendant Nos. 2 and 3 to communicate, with reasons, any objections for such removal:

1. evidence in the form of screenshots showing circulation of such content by such accounts / groups, and;
  2. the content / accounts / groups are identified by (i) Uniform Resource Locators) for Facebook and Instagram services and (ii) by account numbers and/or group name and/or invite link and/or administrator account numbers) for Whatsapp.
- d) Disclose to the Plaintiff the basic subscriber/seller information in their possession (including name, address, email ID, contact number, IP logs, registration details, and payment details) of the group administrators/phone

numbers identified in paragraph 16(iv) and/or Exhibit G hereto who are passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting Plaintiff's Corporate Name being "DBS Bank India Limited" and/or any part thereof and/or any abbreviation/variation thereof and/or impersonating the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials for providing any investment/financial advice/stock market analysis and/or using any corporate name identical and/or deceptively similar to the Plaintiff's Corporate Name and/or unauthorizedly claiming any goods or services to be originating from the Plaintiff, and/or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials, within one week from the date of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court.

- e) Disclose to the Plaintiff, upon request and subject to any restrictions and/or their right to communicate to the Plaintiff any objections, with reasons, to such disclosure, the basic subscriber/seller information in their possession including name, address, email ID, contact number, IP logs, registration details, and payment details) of the uploader who are passing off and/or misusing and/or misrepresenting Plaintiff's Corporate Name being "DBS Bank India Limited" and/or any part thereof and/or any abbreviation/variation thereof and/or impersonating the Plaintiff's Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials for providing any investment/financial advice/stock market analysis and/or using any corporate name identical and/or deceptively similar to the Plaintiff's Corporate Name and/or unauthorizedly claiming any goods or services to be originating from the Plaintiff, and/or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials;

- f) Direct Defendant No. 4 to suspend/block the domain name for the Fake Websites being <https://m.indiadb.me>; <https://m.dbsindia.vip>; <https://ggtk> <https://app.dbscooperation.com/>; [www.fruugostore.vip](http://www.fruugostore.vip) and/or any other similar websites to Fake Websites which are passing off/misusing/misrepresenting the Plaintiff's Corporate Name being "DBS Bank India Limited" and/or any part thereof and/or any abbreviation or variation thereof and/or unauthorizedly claiming any goods or services to be originating from the Plaintiff or endorsed by the Plaintiff and/or its Chief Executive Officer and/or its officials within a period of one week from receipt of the order passed by this Hon'ble Court;"

**[Sharmila U. Deshmukh, J.]**