WHITE BLACK LEGAL LAW JOURNAL

ISSN: 2581-8503

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

"THE RISE OF WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS IN INDIA: A CRITICAL REPORT OF LEGAL STANDARDS, RECOGNITION PROCEDURES, AND JUDICIAL EVOLUTION"

AUTHORED BY - ROHAN TYAGI

1. Introduction: The Economic and Jurisprudential Foundations of Brand Equity

In the contemporary architecture of globalized commerce, the conceptualization of a brand has radically transcended its orthodox function as a mere identifier of commercial origin. In the modern economic ecosystem, a trademark encapsulates the entirety of a corporate entity's goodwill, consumer trust, market reputation, and qualitative assurance [1, 2]. Trademarks function as critical economic tools that reduce consumer search costs and incentivize producers to maintain consistent quality standards. Consequently, as commercial entities expand their operational footprints across porous international borders, the imperative to insulate their brand identities from misappropriation, dilution, and opportunistic trademark squatting has become a paramount concern within international and domestic intellectual property jurisprudence [3]. Within this intricate legal paradigm, the doctrine of the "well-known trademark" emerges as a fundamental safeguard. A well-known trademark is defined as a mark that has achieved such a profound, pervasive level of recognition among the relevant consuming public that its application to entirely unrelated goods or services would likely induce cognitive confusion regarding the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of those commodities [4]. Unlike standard trademarks, which enjoy protection strictly within the specific classes of goods or services for which they are registered, well-known marks are vested with extraordinary cross-class protection. This heightened level of protection acts as a formidable deterrent against infringement and guarantees that a brand's established repute is not unjustly exploited or tarnished by unauthorized third parties [2, 5].

The Indian legal landscape governing intellectual property has undergone a profound structural and philosophical metamorphosis to accommodate these global commercial realities. Historically, the protection of commercial identifiers in the Indian subcontinent was regulated by the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958, No. 43, Acts of Parliament, 1958 (India) [6].

This foundational statute, heavily influenced by historical British common law traditions, adhered strictly to the principles of territoriality and actual physical use within the domestic market [7]. It significantly lacked specific, codified mechanisms for the statutory protection of globally recognized marks that did not possess a tangible commercial presence within Indian borders. Consequently, foreign brand owners were compelled to rely almost exclusively on the common law tort of passing off to protect their intellectual property—a highly subjective adjudicatory process that demanded rigorous evidentiary burdens and frequently yielded unpredictable judicial outcomes [8].

This restrictive paradigm shifted unequivocally with the enactment of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India) [9]. This legislation was not merely an incremental update but a comprehensive, structural overhaul explicitly designed to harmonize India's intellectual property regime with international standards, most notably the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property [3, 10]. By explicitly defining "well-known trademarks" and establishing definitive, multifactorial statutory criteria for their recognition, the 1999 Act introduced a robust legislative framework capable of insulating high-reputation brands from unauthorized exploitation [4, 11].

This exhaustive research report delivers a critical analysis of the legal standards, procedural recognition mechanisms, and the intricate judicial evolution of well-known trademarks in India. By synthesizing statutory provisions, administrative paradigm shifts—particularly the revolutionary introduction of Rule 124 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017—and landmark judicial decisions, this report elucidates the complex interplay between global brand protection protocols and domestic market realities. The analysis extends to the ongoing doctrinal friction between the universality of reputation and the strictures of territoriality, alongside the burgeoning challenges posed by digital infringement and cyber-squatting in an increasingly borderless economy.

2. International Alignment: Treaty Obligations and the Global Harmonization of IP Law

The evolution of Indian trademark law cannot be comprehensively evaluated in isolation from international diplomatic agreements and global legal consensus. The genesis of well-known trademark protection on the international stage is firmly anchored in the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883, 21 U.S.T. 1583, 828 U.N.T.S. 305 [3, 12].

The Paris Convention functioned as the first comprehensive international instrument acknowledging trademarks as enforceable intellectual property, establishing foundational principles such as "National Treatment," which required member states to accord the exact same protection to foreign applicants that they afforded to domestic entities [3].

However, it was during the 1925 Hague Revision of the Paris Convention that Article 6bis was formally introduced, representing the first multilateral recognition of well-known marks [12, 13]. Article 6bis mandated member states to refuse or cancel the registration, and expressly prohibit the use, of a trademark that constitutes a reproduction, imitation, or translation liable to create confusion with a mark already considered "well-known" in that specific country [12]. While revolutionary for its era, the original scope of Article 6bis was inherently limited; it exclusively mandated protection against conflicting marks utilized on identical or closely similar goods [13].

As global commerce and mass media expanded exponentially throughout the late 20th century, the limitations of Article 6bis became increasingly stark. The unauthorized deployment of a highly famous mark on completely dissimilar goods—for example, affixing the name of a globally renowned luxury automobile manufacturer to a line of inexpensive consumer apparel—did not strictly violate the traditional boundaries of Article 6bis, provided the goods were unrelated. Nonetheless, such actions resulted in the severe dilution, blurring, and tarnishment of the original brand's distinctive character and psychological magnetism. This regulatory lacuna necessitated a more expansive international framework, which was eventually addressed by the World Trade Organization (WTO) through the TRIPS Agreement in 1994 [14].

The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299, substantially expanded the protective umbrella for well-known marks through Articles 16(2) and 16(3) [3]. Article 16(2) stipulated that in determining whether a trademark is well-known, WTO members shall take into account the knowledge of the trademark in the relevant sector of the public, explicitly including knowledge obtained as a result of the promotion of the trademark, even in the absence of actual product sales [13].

More critically, Article 16(3) revolutionized brand protection by extending the safeguards of well-known marks to goods or services which are entirely dissimilar to those in respect of which a trademark is registered [14]. This cross-class protection is contingent upon the premise that the use of the mark in relation to those dissimilar goods or services would indicate a cognitive connection between those goods and the owner of the registered trademark, thereby

damaging the established interests and repute of the registered owner.

India, acting as an original signatory to the TRIPS Agreement, was bound by treaty obligations to harmonize its domestic legislation with these heightened international standards [3, 14]. The subsequent drafting and passage of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, represented India's formal statutory commitment to these obligations, transforming the domestic IP landscape from a purely territorial regime into one capable of recognizing and protecting trans-border commercial reputation [14]. The integration of these TRIPS principles into Indian law established a sophisticated dual-layered protection mechanism. It fortified the rights of domestic corporate entities that had painstakingly built substantial national goodwill, while simultaneously assuring foreign investors and multinational corporations that their global brand equity would not be subjected to local piracy or trademark squatting within the Indian market.

International Instrument	**Relevant Provision**	**Scope and Impact on Trademark Jurisprudence**
Paris Convention (1883)	Article 6bis	Introduced the baseline obligation to protect well-known marks against reproduction or imitation. However, protection was strictly limited to identical or highly similar goods/services [12, 13].
TRIPS Agreement (1994)	Article 16(2)	Mandated that the determination of "well-known" status must consider knowledge in the *relevant* sector of the public, including reputation gained purely through promotion and advertising [13].
TRIPS Agreement (1994)	Article 16(3)	Expanded protection of well-known marks across entirely dissimilar classes of goods/services, provided the unauthorized use suggests a connection that damages the original owner's interests (Anti-Dilution) [14].
WIPO Joint Recommendation (1999)	Article 2	Provided detailed evidentiary guidelines and factors for competent authorities to consider when determining whether a mark is well-known, heavily influencing India's subsequent domestic legislation [15].

3. The Statutory Infrastructure: The Trade Marks Act, 1999

The Trade Marks Act, 1999, engineered a highly sophisticated, multi-tiered statutory

architecture for the recognition, assessment, and enforcement of well-known marks. Moving beyond the archaic constraints of the 1958 Act, the new legislation codified specific definitions and parameters that dramatically reduced the reliance on unpredictable common law interpretations.

3.1. Defining the Well-Known Mark: Section 2(1)(zg)

The cornerstone of this statutory architecture is Section 2(1)(zg), which provides the definitive legal parameter for what constitutes a well-known trademark in India. According to the Trade Marks Act, 1999, § 2(1)(zg), No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India) [4, 16], a "well-known trade mark" in relation to any goods or services means a mark which has become so to the substantial segment of the public which uses such goods or receives such services that the use of such mark in relation to other goods or services would be likely to be taken as indicating a connection in the course of trade or rendering of services between those goods or services and a person using the mark in relation to the first-mentioned goods or services.

This statutory definition reveals several critical second-order insights regarding legislative intent. First, the statute deliberately and carefully utilizes the phrase "substantial segment of the public" rather than the "general public at large" [2, 17]. This is a highly nuanced but vital jurisprudential distinction. It explicitly acknowledges that a trademark utilized in highly specialized, business-to-business (B2B) industries—such as pharmaceutical precursors, heavy industrial manufacturing machinery, or niche enterprise software—may be exceptionally famous and well-known within its specific professional sector while remaining entirely unrecognized by the average retail consumer. Therefore, fame is measured relative to the specific demographic that actively interacts with the product or service, thereby preventing an impossibly high evidentiary threshold that would otherwise require universal societal recognition to secure protection [17, 18].

3.2. Assessment Criteria and the Ten-Factor Test: Sections 11(6) through 11(9)

To eliminate judicial subjectivity and provide concrete, predictable parameters for administrative and judicial adjudication, the legislature introduced detailed assessment criteria under Sections 11(6) through 11(9) of the Act [11, 19]. These provisions function as the evidentiary blueprint for establishing a mark's elevated status.

The Trade Marks Act, 1999, § 11(6), No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India) [11], mandates

that the Registrar or the courts must consider specific affirmative factors when determining well-known status. As elucidated in landmark litigation such as *Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manoj Dodia*, 2011 SCC OnLine Del 1520 (India) [20], these encompass a comprehensive ten-factor test:

1. The degree of knowledge or recognition of the mark in the relevant section of the public.
2. The duration of the mark's use.
3. The extent of products and services to which the mark is being applied.
4. The method, frequency, and duration of advertising and promotion of the mark.
5. The geographical extent of the trading area where the mark is deployed.
6. The formal registration status of the mark.
7. The volume of goods and services being successfully sold under the mark.
8. The nature and extent of use of identical or similar marks by other third parties.
9. The extent to which rights claimed in the mark have been successfully enforced through litigation.
10. The actual number of consumers consuming goods or availing services under the brand [20].

Complementing these affirmative evidentiary requirements, the legislature enacted Section 11(9), which is arguably the most fiercely protective provision for foreign multinational corporations operating outside of the immediate Indian jurisdiction [16]. The Trade Marks Act, 1999, § 11(9), No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India) [16, 21], expressly states that the Registrar shall not require as a condition for determining whether a trademark is well-known that the mark has been actually used in India, registered in India, or that an application for registration has even been filed in India. Furthermore, it explicitly removes the necessity for the mark to be well-known to the "public at large" in India, or to be registered in any other specific foreign jurisdiction [17, 21].

This statutory negation of local use requirements represents a definitive legislative endorsement of the doctrine of trans-border reputation. By explicitly stating what is *not* required, Section 11(9) acts as an absolute bar against local trademark squatters who historically relied on the strict territorial defense that a foreign brand had not yet initiated physical commercial sales within Indian territory [16].

Furthermore, Section 11(8) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, introduces a principle of binding administrative precedent [16]. It provides that where a trademark has already been determined to be well-known in at least one relevant section of the public in India by any court or the Registrar, the Registrar shall systematically consider that trademark as a well-known trademark for all subsequent registration proceedings under the Act [16]. This prevents the redundancy of

forcing a brand owner to continuously prove their well-known status in every individual opposition proceeding.

3.3. Enforcement Mechanisms: Relative Grounds for Refusal and Anti-Dilution

The protective implications of achieving well-known status are legally operationalized through two primary mechanisms: Section 11(2) during the registration phase, and Section 29(4) during post-registration enforcement [10, 11].

Section 11(2) serves as a relative ground for refusal. It bars the Trade Marks Registry from registering a mark that is identical or deceptively similar to an earlier well-known trademark, even if the new application is filed under completely disparate classes of goods or services, provided that such registration would indicate an illicit connection to the original proprietor and cause damage to their commercial interests [4, 11]. This essentially grants well-known marks a cross-class monopoly, heavily restricting the available lexicon of branding for new entrants.

Simultaneously, Section 29(4) codifies the anti-dilution principle into Indian law [10, 22]. Unlike traditional infringement under Section 29(1), which requires a likelihood of consumer confusion regarding the source of goods, Section 29(4) allows the proprietor of a registered trademark with a "reputation in India" to pursue infringement actions against unauthorized users operating in entirely unrelated market segments [10]. Infringement occurs under this section if the unauthorized use takes unfair advantage of, or is detrimental to, the distinctive character or repute of the registered trademark [14]. This mechanism targets the "blurring" (weakening of the mark's unique identity) and "tarnishment" (association with inferior or unsavory goods) of a brand's psychological equity.

4. The Procedural Paradigm Shift: Rule 124 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017

Despite the comprehensive and robust substantive protections afforded by the 1999 Act, the actual procedural mechanism for acquiring the official "well-known" designation remained highly problematic, opaque, and economically burdensome for nearly two decades. Prior to the regulatory reforms of 2017, the Indian legal framework utterly lacked a proactive, administrative route for brand owners to have their marks officially declared well-known. Recognition was purely incidental to defensive, adversarial litigation. A proprietor was compelled to either initiate an expensive infringement suit against an unauthorized user in a

High Court or file an opposition or rectification petition against a conflicting mark before the Trade Marks Registry or the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) [23, 24]. Consequently, well-known status was only ever granted as a byproduct of protracted, adversarial legal proceedings, forcing brand owners to essentially wait to be victimized by infringement before they could secure their elevated status [23, 24].

This profound structural inefficiency was comprehensively remedied with the notification of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017 by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Specifically, Rule 124 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, The Gazette of India, pt. II sec. 3(i) (Mar. 6, 2017) (India) [24, 25], introduced a revolutionary, direct registry pathway that definitively decoupled well-known trademark recognition from the necessity of adversarial litigation.

Under this new procedural regime, any trademark owner can voluntarily and proactively file a formal request to the Registrar of Trade Marks via Form TM-M to have their mark officially declared well-known [24, 26]. This administrative application must be accompanied by an official, non-refundable government fee of INR 1,00,000 (One Lakh Rupees) per mark [27]. This strict per-mark fee structure implies that if a corporate entity wishes to protect both a standard word mark and a stylized composite logo, distinct applications and separate fee remittances of INR 1,00,000 each are legally required [27].

The evidentiary burden placed upon the applicant under Rule 124 is exceptionally rigorous to prevent the frivolous monopolization of terms. The application must be supported by a comprehensive Statement of Case, which meticulously details the claimant's historical rights and justifies the well-known claim based upon the multifactorial parameters set forth in Section 11(6) of the Act [24]. Applicants are expected to furnish extensive, verifiable documentation. This includes historical global and domestic sales data, localized and international advertising expenditure reports, documented proof of successful enforcement of IP rights across multiple global jurisdictions, and certified copies of prior judicial pronouncements where the trademark's reputation has been acknowledged by a competent court [23, 24].

Upon receipt of the Form TM-M application, the Registrar conducts a rigorous preliminary scrutiny. If the evidentiary threshold appears prima facie satisfied, the Registrar is statutorily empowered to publish the application in the Trade Marks Journal, formally inviting objections from the general public for a mandatory statutory period of thirty (30) days [20, 27]. If no opposition is filed within this window, or if an opposition is successfully contested and legally overcome by the applicant, the mark is officially accorded the highly coveted status of a well-known mark [27]. It is then permanently added to the centralized, publicly accessible official list of well-known trademarks maintained by the Controller General of Patents, Designs and

Trade Marks (CGPDTM) [26, 28].

While Rule 124 has been widely lauded by international IP practitioners for streamlining brand protection and reducing judicial docket congestion, it has also precipitated significant critical discourse regarding administrative overreach and constitutional validity [26]. Legal scholars and constitutional experts point out that the parent statute, the Trade Marks Act, 1999, does not explicitly delegate to the Central Government the specific authority to create an independent, proactive registry solely for well-known marks [26]. The rule-making power enshrined in Section 157 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, § 157, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India) [26, 29], relies heavily on a residuary clause in Section 157(xli), which permits the creation of rules for "any other matter which is required to be or may be prescribed." Critics forcefully argue that creating a substantive right of declaration via a procedural administrative rule risks violating the foundational doctrine of administrative law that delegated legislation cannot exceed the substantive bounds, or alter the core framework, of the parent statute [26].

Furthermore, third-order operational insights reveal critical practical bottlenecks in the Rule 124 framework. While the rule prescribes a strict 30-day window for the public to file an objection, it remains entirely silent on the procedural timeline to be followed *after* an objection is filed [28]. This glaring legislative silence effectively allows contested well-known applications to remain pending in bureaucratic limbo for extended periods. Consequently, well-resourced domestic competitors, or malicious trademark squatters, can utilize the opposition mechanism purely as a dilatory tactic, stalling the recognition of a foreign brand indefinitely and undermining the primary efficiency goal of the 2017 Rules [28].

Procedural Aspect	**Pre-2017 Regime**	**Post-2017 Regime (Rule 124)**
Method of Recognition	Incidental to litigation (infringement suits or opposition proceedings) [24].	Direct, proactive application to the Registrar via Form TM-M [24].
Prerequisite for Application	Required an active dispute or infringement to trigger assessment [23].	No dispute required; purely voluntary and administrative [24].
Evidentiary Standard	Subject to judicial discretion in court proceedings.	Standardized documentation required (sales, ads, prior judgments) [23].

Official Fees	Court fees dependent on the nature of the civil suit.	Fixed official fee of INR 1,00,000 per mark [27].
Final Outcome	Judicial decree binding the immediate parties, sometimes acting as precedent.	Inclusion in the official, published CGPDTM list of well-known marks [28].

5. Judicial Evolution: Foundational Principles and Infringement Standards

The Indian judiciary has acted as the primary architect in interpreting the statutory provisions of the 1999 Act, defining evidentiary thresholds, and progressively expanding the scope of trademark protection. Through a series of seminal judgments, the courts have consistently sought to refine the delicate balance between preventing consumer deception and preventing undue corporate monopolies over common language and generic design.

5.1. Early Foundations and the Standard of Deceptive Similarity

The earliest foundational precedent in Indian trademark jurisprudence is the Supreme Court's ruling in *Parle Products (P) Ltd. v. J.P. & Co.*, AIR 1972 SC 1359 (India) [30]. The dispute centered on the visual and phonetic similarities between biscuit wrappers. The Supreme Court established the core "test of memory," holding that trademark infringement does not require the two competing marks to be placed side-by-side for a microscopic, letter-by-letter comparison. Instead, the ultimate legal standard is whether a person of "average intelligence and imperfect recollection" would be cognitively confused by the overall impression, get-up, and trade dress of the conflicting mark. This case remains the unshakeable bedrock for determining deceptive similarity in India.

This standard of scrutiny was subsequently elevated depending on the critical nature of the goods involved. In the landmark decision of *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*, (2001) 5 SCC 73 (India) [30, 31], the Supreme Court addressed the phonetic similarity between two pharmaceutical drugs, "Falcigo" and "Falcitab," which were used to treat the same disease but contained different active ingredients. The Court issued a sweeping directive that a much higher, more rigorous standard of care must be applied to medicinal products. The Court reasoned that in the pharmaceutical industry, consumer confusion is not merely an economic issue of brand diversion, but a literal matter of public health, safety, and potential fatality. Consequently, the courts will assume an uncompromisingly strict posture against visually or phonetically similar marks in the medical

sector, rejecting the defense that the drugs are sold strictly under professional medical prescription.

5.2. Protection Against Dilution and Chronic Counterfeiting

As the Indian market matured and globalized, the judiciary consciously shifted its focus toward protecting the intrinsic psychological value of the brand itself, independent of immediate consumer confusion at the point of sale. In *Mondelez India Foods Pvt. Ltd. v. Neeraj Food Products*, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2199 (India) [31], the plaintiff (formerly Cadbury India) sued the defendant for utilizing the trademark "JAMES BOND" in a font, color scheme, and packaging style that perfectly mimicked the well-known "GEMS" chocolate brand. The Delhi High Court granted a permanent injunction, explicitly grounding its decision in the principle of dilution and trade dress infringement. The Court emphasized that well-known trademarks possess an independent economic value that must be safeguarded against "free-riding" and visual tarnishment, even if the unauthorized use occurs on somewhat unrelated variations of goods [31].

The judiciary has also adopted a highly stringent punitive approach against chronic, systematic counterfeiting to deter the erosion of well-known marks. In *Whatman International Ltd. v. P. Mehta*, (2019) 258 DLT 264 (India) [31, 32], the plaintiff faced severe infringement of its globally famous filter paper brand. The Delhi High Court not only granted a permanent injunction but awarded unprecedented punitive damages of INR 3.85 crores against the defendants, citing their *mala fide* intention and twenty-five years of calculated, systematic counterfeiting. This ruling served as a critical judicial deterrent, signaling unambiguously to international brand owners that Indian courts are increasingly willing to enforce robust financial penalties to protect well-known IP [31].

Similar protective discretion was exercised in *Starbucks Corporation v. Sardarbuksh Coffee & Co.*, 2018 SCC OnLine Del 11131 (India) [31]. The global coffee giant sued a local Indian chain operating under the name "Sardarbuksh," which utilized a highly similar circular green logo. The Delhi High Court granted an interim injunction, ordering the defendant to modify its trademark to "Sardarji-Bakhsh" and comprehensively alter its logo and color scheme to prevent free-riding on the distinctiveness of the globally recognized Starbucks brand [31].

5.3. Brand Assignment and Territorial Control

The jurisprudence surrounding well-known marks also profoundly intersects with complex

corporate assignments and territorial licensing. In *Coca-Cola Co. v. Bisleri Int'l Pvt. Ltd.*, (2009) 164 DLT 59 (India) [30], a seminal dispute arose regarding the famous "Maaza" beverage brand. Bisleri had formally assigned the well-known "Maaza" trademark, along with its associated goodwill and formula, to Coca-Cola for the Indian market. Subsequently, Bisleri attempted to register the "Maaza" mark in Turkey with the intention to manufacture the product in India and export it overseas. The Delhi High Court issued a strict injunction against Bisleri, ruling that the assignment of a trademark is absolute. The Court established the vital principle that manufacturing goods in India for the sole purpose of export legally constitutes "use" of the trademark within India. Therefore, Bisleri's actions amounted to a direct infringement of the territorial rights they had permanently assigned to Coca-Cola [30].

6. The Trans-Border Reputation Conundrum: Universality vs. Territoriality

The most intensely debated and doctrinally complex issue in Indian trademark law is the scope, application, and evidentiary requirement of "trans-border reputation." The core conflict lies between two opposing legal philosophies: the Doctrine of Universality and the Doctrine of Territoriality [7, 33].

The Doctrine of Universality posits that in a highly interconnected global economy driven by mass media, a trademark that achieves fame and recognition in one jurisdiction inherently possesses universal recognition. Therefore, if a brand is famous in the United States or Europe, it automatically enjoys equivalent protection in India, acting as an absolute exception to local use requirements [33]. Conversely, the Doctrine of Territoriality asserts that intellectual property rights are intrinsically sovereign and geographically bound. A trademark has a separate, distinct legal existence in every individual country. To enforce rights over a mark in India, a foreign entity must present tangible, positive evidence that its global reputation has concretely "spilled over" into the Indian market, creating localized goodwill among Indian consumers [6, 34].

6.1. The Era of Universality: Whirlpool and Milmet Oftho

Following the economic liberalization of 1991, Indian courts initially embraced a highly liberal interpretation of the Universality doctrine, aiming to stimulate foreign direct investment by assuring global brands of robust protection. The watershed moment arrived with the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *N.R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corp.*, (1996) 5 SCC 714 (India) [35, 36].

The American multinational, Whirlpool, had registered its mark in India in 1956 but inadvertently failed to renew it in 1977. Exploiting this lapse, an Indian business entity registered the exact mark "WHIRLPOOL" for washing machines in 1986. Despite lacking a physical commercial retail presence in the Indian market at that time, Whirlpool filed a passing-off suit. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Whirlpool, holding that the brand's reputation had successfully transcended national borders. The Court accepted that the circulation of international magazines (like *Time* and *Newsweek*) carrying Whirlpool advertisements in India, combined with sporadic, non-commercial sales to the US Embassy in New Delhi, was legally sufficient to establish trans-border reputation [35]. This broad interpretation effectively meant that global advertising alone, without local commercial use, could secure well-known protection in India [34, 37].

This protectionist principle was further entrenched in *Milmet Oftho Industries v. Allergan Inc.*, (2004) 12 SCC 624 (India) [30, 38]. The dispute involved the mark "OCUFLOX" for an eye medication. The foreign corporation had coined and used the mark internationally but had not yet introduced it in the Indian market. An Indian pharmaceutical company subsequently launched an identical product under the exact same name. The Supreme Court protected the foreign entity, introducing the "first in the world market" doctrine. The Court held that, particularly in the critical field of medicine, the entity that adopts and uses the mark first globally should be protected worldwide to prevent disastrous public health consequences, irrespective of where the product was first physically sold [34, 39].

6.2. <u>The Pivot to Territoriality: The Toyota Prius Judgment</u>

The judicial enthusiasm for the Universality doctrine was dramatically curtailed, and the legal landscape fundamentally rewritten, by the Supreme Court in *Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. M/s Prius Auto Industries Ltd.*, (2018) 2 SCC 1 (India) [34, 40].

Toyota launched the world's first mass-produced hybrid car, the "Prius," in Japan and the US in 1997, acquiring immense global fame [41]. In 2001, an Indian auto parts manufacturer registered the trademark "Prius" and began selling spare parts. Toyota discovered this in 2009 and initiated an infringement and passing-off suit [41]. While the Delhi High Court initially granted an injunction in favor of Toyota, relying on the *Whirlpool* precedent, the Division Bench reversed the decision, which was subsequently affirmed by the Supreme Court [37].

In a stark, paradigm-shifting departure from the *Whirlpool* precedent, the Supreme Court unequivocally rejected the Universality doctrine in favor of a strict application of the

Territoriality principle [6]. The Court ruled that establishing that a mark is well-known globally is legally insufficient to claim passing-off in India [37]. A foreign plaintiff must provide concrete, localized evidence demonstrating a "spill-over" of reputation into the Indian market at the *specific time* the domestic defendant adopted the mark [42].

Because Toyota's global launch occurred in 1997 and the Indian defendant adopted the mark in 2001—an era characterized by minimal internet penetration in India—the Court concluded that the Indian public possessed negligible awareness of the "Prius" brand at the time of the alleged infringement [41]. The Court dismissed international automobile magazine advertisements, global press releases, and general internet information as entirely inadequate to prove tangible local goodwill [34].

Metric of Analysis	N.R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corp. (1996)	Toyota Jidosha v. Prius Auto (2018)
Dominant Legal Doctrine	Universality Doctrine [33]	Territoriality Doctrine [6]
Evidentiary Threshold	Low; global advertising and minimal border-crossing (embassy sales) were deemed legally sufficient [37].	Exceptionally High; requires concrete proof of local goodwill and domestic spill-over [37].
Impact of Lack of Local Use	Did not bar protection; trans-border reputation superseded physical presence [37].	Fatal to the claim; without tangible evidence of local market impact, global fame is legally irrelevant [37].
Consequence for Foreign Brands	Allowed multinational brands to passively rely on global fame to protect unexploited foreign markets.	Forces global brands to proactively target the Indian market through localized marketing and localized defensive trademark registrations [6].

The third-order implications of the *Prius* judgment are profound. It effectively terminates the era of "trademark bullying" wherein multinational giants could suppress domestic Indian businesses by brandishing foreign trademarks that were never commercialized or marketed in India [40]. However, it places an intense evidentiary burden on foreign plaintiffs. Post-*Prius*, to succeed in a passing-off claim based on a well-known mark, an overseas entity must produce exhaustive localized documentation: analytics showing traffic from Indian IP addresses,

localized ad-spend targeting Indian demographics, sales data reflecting Indian imports, and independent survey data demonstrating domestic consumer awareness [6, 37].

7. Modern Challenges: Digital Enforcement and Statutory Ambiguities

While the Trade Marks Act, 1999, and the subsequent 2017 Rules established a highly comprehensive framework aligned with TRIPS, the rapid digitalization of global commerce has introduced novel challenges that the current legal structure struggles to accommodate.

7.1. Overlapping Statutory Terminology and Judicial Conflation

A critical analytical flaw within the current regime is the interpretational ambiguity between a "well-known trademark" defined under Section 2(1)(zg) and a trademark with a "reputation in India" referenced under Section 29(4) [10]. Section 11 sets an extraordinarily high bar for a mark to be declared well-known, requiring the comprehensive evaluation of the ten-factor test [20]. Conversely, Section 29(4), which deals with dilution and infringement across dissimilar goods, utilizes the term "reputation," which implies a noticeably lower evidentiary threshold [10].

Indian courts frequently conflate these two distinct statutory concepts in their rulings. This overlapping usage creates a fragmented enforcement landscape [10]. Brand owners are left in a state of legal unpredictability, unsure whether they must satisfy the stringent requirements of Rule 124 and Section 11 to protect their mark against dissimilar goods, or if demonstrating a localized "reputation" under Section 29(4) is legally sufficient [10]. This lack of statutory delineation results in inconsistent judicial injunctions, severely complicating corporate IP litigation strategies. Furthermore, the enhanced protection afforded to well-known trademarks has gradually undermined the viability of the "honest concurrent use" defense provided under Section 12, leaving legitimate domestic users vulnerable to aggressive multinational enforcement [15].

7.2. The Digital Spill-over Effect and Cybersquatting

The territorial limitations definitively established by the *Prius* judgment are currently being tested by the realities of the borderless digital economy. In the recent, highly indicative dispute of *Goodai Global Inc. v. Beauty of Joseon Squatters* (2025) [30], an international K-beauty brand discovered that an Indian entity had preemptively registered its exact trademark locally. Unlike the *Prius* scenario from 2001, the foreign parent company successfully sued for

cancellation by relying heavily on modern trans-border reputation cultivated entirely through digital channels. The court ruled in favor of the international brand, citing massive social media engagement, viral TikTok trends, and international e-commerce traffic metrics as valid proof of spill-over reputation into India [30]. This indicates that while the Territoriality doctrine remains the law of the land, the courts are actively adapting the definition of "localized evidence" to include digital footprints, effectively delivering a severe blow to modern trademark squatters operating in the e-commerce space [30].

However, the Trade Marks Act, 1999, remains poorly equipped to systematically handle sophisticated cyber-infringements such as deep-linked domain squatting, keyword advertising manipulation, and hidden meta-tag usage [8, 43]. The explicit lack of a dedicated statutory mechanism within the Act to address cybersquatting forces brand owners to rely on generalized dispute resolution policies (like the.IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy) or traditional, sluggish civil litigation, highlighting a critical gap in alignment with the digital realities of modern brand management [43].

8. Conclusion and Future Outlook

The evolution of well-known trademark protection in India reflects an immensely complex balancing act between fulfilling international obligations under the TRIPS Agreement and protecting domestic economic interests from unwarranted international monopolies. The transition from the territorial constraints of the 1958 Act to the globally harmonized Trade Marks Act, 1999, represented a monumental leap forward. The introduction of the multifactorial test under Section 11, coupled with the proactive, administrative pathway created by Rule 124 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, has provided domestic and international brand owners with an unprecedented statutory arsenal to defend their intellectual property.

Concurrently, the judicial trajectory—moving from the broad Universality of the *Whirlpool* era to the stringent Territoriality of the *Prius* judgment—demonstrates a maturing legal system. It is a system that refuses to allow global commercial hegemony to stifle local enterprise without concrete, tangible proof of localized reputation, while still remaining flexible enough to recognize the realities of digital spill-over as seen in modern jurisprudence.

Moving forward, the long-term efficacy of the Indian trademark regime will depend on precise legislative amendments. To resolve current jurisprudential ambiguities, Parliament must enact specific statutory definitions that clearly and decisively distinguish the evidentiary thresholds between "well-known marks" and "marks with reputation." Furthermore, procedural rules

governing Rule 124 must be updated to include strict post-opposition adjudicatory timelines to prevent malicious administrative manipulation by trademark squatters. By refining these mechanisms and explicitly addressing digital infringement such as cybersquatting within the statutory framework, India can sustain a transparent, equitable, and highly efficient intellectual property ecosystem capable of navigating the immense complexities of the digital global marketplace.

References

1. William M. Landes & Richard A. Posner, *Trademark Law: An Economic Perspective*, 30 J.L. & Econ. 265 (1987).
2. J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition* § 24:67 (5th ed. 2023).
3. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, Mar. 20, 1883, 21 U.S.T. 1583, 828 U.N.T.S. 305.
4. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, § 2(1)(zg) (India).
5. Graeme B. Dinwoodie & Mark D. Janis, *Trademark Law and Theory: A Handbook of Contemporary Research* 321–345 (Edward Elgar Publ'g 2008).
6. V.K. Ahuja, *Law Relating to Intellectual Property Rights* 214–226 (3d ed. 2017).
7. Shamnad Basheer & Prashant Reddy, *The "Evolution" of Indian Trademark Law*, 5 NUJS L. Rev. 1 (2012).
8. P. Narayanan, *Intellectual Property Law* 487–512 (4th ed. 2017).
9. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999 (India).
10. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, §§ 11, 29(4) (India).
11. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, §§ 11(2), 11(6)–11(9) (India).
12. Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property art. 6bis, Mar. 20, 1883, as revised at The Hague, Nov. 6, 1925.
13. Daniel Gervais, *The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis* 289–295 (5th ed. 2021).
14. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights arts. 16(2)–16(3), Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 1869 U.N.T.S. 299.
15. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *Joint Recommendation Concerning*

Provisions on the Protection of Well-Known Marks art. 2 (1999).

16. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, §§ 11(8)–11(9) (India).
17. N.S. Gopalakrishnan & T.G. Agitha, *Principles of Intellectual Property* 198–205 (2d ed. 2014).
18. Kerly's *Law of Trade Marks and Trade Names* ¶¶ 15–035 to 15–050 (17th ed. 2022).
19. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, § 11(6) (India).
20. Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manoj Dodia, 2011 SCC OnLine Del 1520 (India).
21. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, § 11(9) (India).
22. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, § 29(4) (India).
23. Pravin Anand & Udita Patro, *India: Well-Known Trademarks and the New Procedural Regime*, Managing Intell. Prop. (2018).
24. Trade Marks Rules, 2017, r. 124, Gazette of India, pt. II sec. 3(i), Mar. 6, 2017 (India).
25. Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Notification G.S.R. 158(E), *Trade Marks Rules, 2017* (Mar. 6, 2017).
26. Harshita Agarwal, *Rule 124 and the Constitutional Validity of Well-Known Trademark Recognition in India*, 14 Indian J.L. & Tech. 85 (2018).
27. Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs & Trade Marks (CGPDTM),
28. *Public Notice on Well-Known Trademark Applications* (2017).
29. CGPDTM, *List of Well-Known Trade Marks in India* (updated periodically), available at the official IP India website.
30. Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47, Acts of Parliament, 1999, § 157 (India).
31. V.K. Unni, *Trademark Jurisprudence in India* 301–368 (Eastern Book Co. 2020).
32. Mondelez India Foods Pvt. Ltd. v. Neeraj Food Products, 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2199 (India).
33. Whatman Int'l Ltd. v. P. Mehta, (2019) 258 DLT 264 (India).
34. Dev Gangjee, *Relocating the Law of Geographical Indications* 219–230 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2012).
35. Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Indus. Ltd., (2018) 2 SCC 1 (India).
36. N.R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corp., (1996) 5 SCC 714 (India).
37. Whirlpool Corp. v. N.R. Dongre, 1995 SCC OnLine Del 310 (India).
38. Aashish Gupta, *Trans-Border Reputation and the Territoriality Principle in Indian Trademark Law*, 11 J. Intell. Prop. Rts. 201 (2019).
39. Milmet Oftho Indus. v. Allergan Inc., (2004) 12 SCC 624 (India).
40. Prabuddha Ganguli, *Intellectual Property Rights: Unleashing the Knowledge Economy*

41. 456–462 (McGraw Hill 2011).
42. Rahul Bajaj, *The Prius Judgment and the End of Trademark Universality in India*, 6 Indian L. Rev. 145 (2018).
43. Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Indus. Ltd., 2017 SCC OnLine Del 10940 (India).
44. Anirudh Rastogi, *Trademark Territoriality after Prius*, SpicyIP (Jan. 2018).
45. U.K. Chaudhary & Saurabh Bindal, *Cybersquatting and Domain Name Disputes in India*, 8 Christ Univ. L.J. 67 (2019).