

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSPetition for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 35616/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 26-09-2025 in FAO(OS)(COMM) No. 239/2023 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

THE TRUSTEES OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE VAGDEVI EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 130328/2026 - EARLY HEARING APPLICATION, IA No. 154993/2026 - MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDER AND IA No. 110793/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 1517/2026 (XIV)

Date : 29-05-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Chander Lall, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Nancy Roy, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Chug, Adv.
Ms. Annanya Mehan, Adv.
Mr. Divye Chugh, Adv.
Mr. Rachit Raushan, Adv.
Ms. Shivangi Agnihotri, Adv.
Mr. Manish Sharma, AOR

Dr. Aditya Sondhi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Kishor Lambat, Adv.
Ms. Suja Joshi, Adv.
Mrs. Kashmira Lambat, Adv.
Mr. Devika Dhawan, Adv.
Mr. Rijuk Sarkar, Adv.
M/s. Lambat & Legiteam, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Dr. Aditya Sondhi, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Suja Joshi, Adv.
Mr. Kishor Lambat, Adv.
Ms. Kashmira Lambat, Adv.

Ms. Devika Dhawan, Adv.
Mr. Rijuk Sarkar, Adv.
M/s. Lambat & Legiteam, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel, the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Having heard the learned senior counsel for the parties at length and given the peculiar facts of this case, we propose to dispose of this petition with a few additions to the impugned order passed by a Division Bench of the Delhi High Court.
2. As C.S.(Comm) No. 270/2022 is pending consideration before a learned Judge of the High Court of Delhi, we do not wish to venture any opinion on the merits of the matter. We may, however, note that the learned Judge denied interim relief to the petitioner but the same was reversed in appeal, to some extent, by a Division Bench of the High Court, *vide* the impugned order dated 26.09.2025 in FA0(OS)(Comm) No. 239/2023.
3. Thereby, the Division Bench observed that the petitioner had made out a *prima facie* case in its favour, but when it came to the question of irreparable loss and balance of convenience it opined that, as the respondents have been using the impugned mark since the year 1991 and their presence was confined only to the State of Telangana, the petitioner had failed to make out an adequate case to meet the tests in that regard. The Division Bench accordingly thought it fit to restrain the respondents from using the mark 'Princeton' and any other mark deceptively similar thereto for any new institution during the pendency of the suit, but permitted them to continue to use the

mark for the institutions which were already being run under the name of 'Princeton', subject to the condition that they file affidavits of the receipts from such institutions, every six months.

4. There can be no doubt that the petitioner, an Ivy League school in the United States of America (USA), has its reputation and goodwill to protect. Students may well be misled by the use of its name by others offering educational courses. In that view of the matter, we deem it appropriate to add further conditions, in addition to what have been imposed by the Division Bench of the High Court, to safeguard its interest and also the interests of prospective students of the respondents' institutes/colleges.
5. The respondents shall, accordingly, notify and publish a disclaimer on their Website, their Prospectus(es) and any other admission material that is distributed amongst candidates applying for admission to the six institutes/colleges being run by them under the name 'Princeton', stating in clear terms that they have no connection whatsoever with Princeton University, New Jersey, United States of America. The disclaimer on the Website shall be in the largest font size used therein.
6. Apart from the above, the respondents shall also publish a quarter-page notice in 'Deccan Chronicle' and 'Eenadu' newspapers having circulation in the State of Telangana, stating that the six institutes/colleges that they run, mentioned clearly by name, have no connection whatsoever with

- the Princeton University, New Jersey, United States of America. Such notices shall be published for a week, on alternate day basis, that is, on 1st, 3rd, 5th, 8th, 10th and 12th of June, 2026.
7. The respondents shall prominently display a Board outside each of the six institutes/colleges stating to the same effect, i.e., that the institute/college has no connection whatsoever with the Princeton University, New Jersey, United States of America.
 8. Further, in the event the respondents issue any certificate(s) to their students in the name(s) of the six institutes/colleges, such certificates shall also contain the aforestated disclaimer in clear and bold letters.
 9. The above directions shall be acted upon and given effect to before the admission process commences for the next academic year.
 10. We make it clear that all issues are left open to be considered in C.S. (Comm) No. 270/2022. We, however, reiterate the observation made by the Division Bench that the parties shall endeavour to have the suit decided expeditiously.
 11. The special leave petitions are disposed of in the above terms. Pending applications shall stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK GUGLANI)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(PREETI SAXENA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)