



\$~46

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

+ **CS(COMM) 1238/2025 & I.As. 28695-700/2025**

LIVING MEDIA INDIA LIMITED AND ANRPlaintiffs

Through: Mr. Abhishek Malhotra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Rahul Beruar, Ms. Nidhi Jain,
Ms. Manini Sidhu, Ms. Aeshna
Raghuwani, Mr. Kartikay Dutta &
Ms. Anukriti Trivedi, Advocates

versus

AMAR UJALA LIMITED AND ORSDefendants

Through: Mr. P. R. Rajhans, Mr. Tarun Kumar,
Mr. Abhishek and Ms. Pratibha,
Advocates for D-1 (Through VC)
Mr. Mayank Mikhail Mukherjee,
Advocate for D-2
Mr. Soumya Ray Chowdhury, Ms.
Ashika Daga, Mr. Raunak Das
Sharma, Ms. Sanchali Bhowmik,
Advocates for D-4 (Through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **21.11.2025**

CS(COMM) 1238/2025

1. Mr. P. R. Rajhans, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of defendant no. 1.

1.1 He states on instructions that without prejudice to its rights and contentions, defendant no. 1 has removed the infringing URL www.amamjala.com/tags/aaj-tak.



1.2 He states that defendant no. 1's use of the trademark 'AAJ TAK' falls within the ambit of fair use; however, defendant no. 1 does not wish to contest the suit and the same can be disposed of recording the submissions of defendant no. 1 that it will not use the plaintiff's trademark 'AAJ TAK' either as a part of its source code of its websites and/or as a meta tag.

2. Mr. Mayank Mikhail Mukherjee, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of defendant no. 2.

2.1 He as well states on instructions that defendant no. 2 has already removed the infringing link, <https://hindi.news18.com/tag/aaj-tak-live/>, and, in fact, the issue could have been resolved amicably had the plaintiff approached defendant no. 2 prior to filing the suit.

2.2 He states that defendant no. 2 does not wish to join issues with the plaintiff and the suit can be disposed of on its statement to the effect that defendant will not use the plaintiff's trademark 'AAJ TAK' as a part of the source code of its website and/or as a meta tag.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiffs' states that in view of the aforesaid submissions of defendant nos. 1 and 2, the plaintiffs have no objection if the suit is disposed of qua defendant nos. 1 and 2.

4. Learned counsel for defendant no. 1 is directed to file his Vakalatnama within a period of one (1) week.

5. Learned counsel for defendant no. 2 states that he has already filed his Vakalatnama.

6. The aforesaid statements of defendant nos. 1 and 2 are taken on record and they are bound down to the same.

7. Accordingly, in view of the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties, the suit is hereby decreed against defendant nos. 1 and 2 and



they are hereby restrained from using plaintiff's registered trademark "AAJ TAK" and/or "आज तक" as a source code of its websites and/or from using as meta tags amounting to infringement and/or passing off.

8. Registry is directed to draw up a decree sheet vis-à-vis defendant nos. 1 and 2 in terms of this Order.

I.A. 28696/2025 (Under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 CPC)

9. Learned counsel for defendant no. 4 states that defendant no. 4 is an agency, and the subject matter of the suit is its reports in Bangla.

9.1 He states that the infringing link which has been complained of by the plaintiffs reported a news, which originated from 'AAJ TAK'.

9.2 He states that the reference to 'AAJ TAK' in the news report was solely for the purpose of giving credit to the Plaintiffs, and that Defendant No. 4 had no intention to infringe the trademark.

9.3 He states that he will file a more detailed response to the application; however, without prejudice to its rights and contentions, it will remove the infringing link within 48 hours.

10. Learned senior counsel for the plaintiff states that defendant no. 4 could have given credit to the plaintiff by mentioning the plaintiff's name in the however, that would not justify the use of its trademark 'AAJ TAK' as a meta tag or on the website.

10.1 He states that plaintiff has also perused the content of the infringing link and it does not bear out the submission of the counsel for the defendant no. 4.

11. Defendant no. 4 is accordingly directed to remove the infringing link within 48 hours. The rights and contentions of plaintiff and defendant no. 4



are hereby reserved and will be considered after parties have completed their pleadings.

12. Reply to the captioned application be filed within two (2) weeks. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

Defendant no. 3

13. Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that defendant no. 3 has been duly served and in fact after receiving service, the legal counsel for defendant no. 3 had reached out to the instructing counsel and therefore, they are conscious that the matter is listed today.

14. None appears on behalf of defendant no. 3. The matter was passed-over to await the appearance of the defendant no. 3.

15. In the interest of justice, list on **24.11.2025**.

16. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
NOVEMBER 21, 2025/rhc/AM