INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed



www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis. All rights reserved.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND PASSING OFF

A Critical Legal Analysis of Statutory and Common Law Rights in India

AUTHORED BY - VINAY HOODA
School of Law, Bennett University

ABSTRACT

In today's commercial marketplace, a brand's identity is often its most valuable asset. Under Indian intellectual property law, brand owners protect their commercial reputation through two distinct legal mechanisms: the statutory claim of trademark infringement and the common law remedy of passing off. While these two actions frequently overlap in practice, they stem from different legal origins and serve different purposes. Statutory infringement protects the exclusive, registered rights granted under statute. Passing off, on the other hand, protects an established business reputation against deceptive tactics that mislead consumers. This paper explores the framework established by the Trade Marks Act, 1999, examining the statutory prerequisites for infringement alongside the common law rules governing passing off. By evaluating landmark decisions ofthe Supreme Court of India, this paper illustrates how courts analyze deceptive similarity, brand goodwill, and market context—especially in sensitive sectors like pharmaceuticals and modern e-commerce. Ultimately, the study highlights why a dual approach is essential to balance monopoly rights with fair commercial competition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every commercial enterprise relies on brand identifiers whether a name, logo, slogan, packaging layout, or color scheme to signal quality and build consumer trust. Modern consumers rarely inspect the internal manufacturing details of every product they buy; instead, they rely on recognized brand names to make quick, informed choices. As a result, trademarks serve as crucial indicators of commercial origin. Over time, an effective trademark builds up significant goodwill, becoming an invaluable asset for the business.

However, the value of a strong brand also makes it a target for unfair competition. When competitors use identical or confusingly similar marks, they disrupt the link between a

ISSN: 2582-6433

business and its customers. This misleads consumers and allows copiers to profit off someone else's hard work. To address these practices, Indian intellectual property law relies on two distinct legal remedies: statutory trademark infringement and the traditional.

This paper examines how statutory rights and common law remedies work together within the Indian legal system. It begins with an overview of the statutory provisions, explores the judicial standards used to evaluate deceptive similarity, and compares how courts handle infringement versus passing off. The discussion then analyzes key Supreme Court precedents, procedural requirements, evidentiary standards, and the emerging challenges posed by e-commerce. It concludes with practical recommendations for modern brand enforcement.

2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

The primary statute governing trademark registration and protection in India is the Trade Marks Act, 1999. Under Section 2(1)(zb), a "trade mark" is defined as any mark capable of being represented graphically that can distinguish the goods or services of one person from those of others. This broad definition encompasses traditional elements like brand names and logos, as wellnon-traditional elements such as shape marks, packaging designs, and distinct color combinations, provided they serve to identify the commercial source in trade.

Section 27 sets up a clear distinction between registered and unregistered marks. Under Section 27(1), a brand owner cannot bring a statutory suit for infringement unless the mark is formally registered under the Act. However, Section 27(2) makes it clear that nothing in the statute limits a business's common law right to bring an action for passing off. Thus, while registration grants statutory protection, unregistered mark holders can still seek reliefunder common law principles if they can prove goodwill and deceptive misrepresentation in court.

When a mark is successfully registered, Section 28 grants the proprietor exclusive rights to use the mark in relation to the specified goods or services and to seek statutory remedies for infringement. Section 29 then outlines the conditions under which a mark is considered infringed, including unauthorized use of an identical or deceptively similar mark for similar goods, as well as protection against dilution for well-known marks.

At the same time, the Act includes safeguards to ensure fair competition. Section 30 provides

ISSN: 2582-6433

exceptions for honest concurrent use, descriptive references, and comparative advertising. In addition, Section 34 protects "prior users"—traders who used a mark in good faith before another party registered or used it. These provisions ensure that statutory rights do not unfairly restrict honest business practices or legitimate competition in the market.

3. TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

Trademark infringement is a statutory cause of action created by law. To succeed in an infringement claim under the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the plaintiff must prove three main elements: valid ownership of a registered mark, unauthorized commercial use by the defendant, and that the defendant's mark is identical or deceptively similar under Section 29.

When an unauthorized party uses an identical mark for identical goods or services, courts presume confusion under Section 29(1). However, most litigation involves marks or goods that are similar rather than identical. In these cases, under Section 29(2), the plaintiff must show that the defendant's use creates a likelihood of consumer confusion or an impression of commercial association between the two businesses.

To determine deceptive similarity, Indian courts do not conduct side-by-side, technical comparisons of isolated letters or minor design variations. Instead, they evaluate the overall visual, phonetic, and conceptual impression created by the marks. Judges consider the target audience, the nature of the goods, pricing, purchasing habits, and trade channels. The law recognizes that ordinary consumers rely on general recollections rather than precise memory when making purchasing decisions.

In the landmark case of *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*, the Supreme Court stressed that tests for deceptive similarity must consider the specific commercial context. The Court noted that stricter standards apply to medicinal products, as confusion over pharmaceutical brands can lead to serious health risks beyond financial harm. The judgment established key guidelines, requiring courts to assess the nature of the marks, the degree of resemblances, the class of consumers, and the intelligence level of average buyers in the relevant marketplace.

It is worth noting that a plaintiff in an infringement action does not need to prove actual

ISSN: 2582-6433

consumer confusion or actual monetary loss. The statutory test under Section 29 centers on whether the unauthorized use is likely to confuse the public or establish an association with the registered mark. Furthermore, Section 29 covers unauthorized use in advertisements, corporate trade names, and domain names, ensuring comprehensive protection for registered brand owners across channels.

4. PASSING OFF

Passing off is a common law remedy designed to prevent one trader from falsely representing their goods or services as those of another.Its primary goal is to protect a firm's hard-earned business reputation and shield consumers from commercial deceit. Unlike infringement, passing off does not depend on statutory registration. However, the plaintiff bears a heavier burden of proof, as they must establish goodwill, deceptive misrepresentation, and resulting commercial damage in court.

The foundational framework for passing off was articulated in *Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd. v. Borden Inc.* (the *Jif Lemon* case), establishing what is widely known as the "Classical Trinity": goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage.Indian courts consistently apply these three principles in passing off disputes across all commercial sectors:

Goodwill & Reputation: The plaintiff must prove that their brand name, logo, or get-up has built substantial goodwill in the market, leading consumers to associate it directly with their business.Goodwill is established through sales figures, advertising expenditure, market presence, and long-term continuous use in commerce.

Deceptive Misrepresentation: The plaintiff must show that the defendant's conduct leads, or is likely to lead, the public to believe that their goods or services are connected to the plaintiff. Misrepresentation can arise from confusing packaging, similar names, or misleading domain names.

Damage or Likelihood of Harm: The plaintiff must show that they have suffered, or are likely to suffer, actual financial loss, damage to reputation, or loss ofmarket control due to the defendant's deceptive actions.

Because passing off protects goodwill rather than the mark itself, it applies broadly to unregistered trade names, product designs, trade dress, and service marks. However,

ISSN: 2582-6433

success depends heavily on the quality of evidence provided to prove market recognition.

5. INFRINGEMENT AND PASSING OFF: KEY DIFFERENCES

While plaintiffs often join claims for statutory infringement and passing off in the same lawsuit, the legal foundations differ fundamentally. Infringement enforces statutory rights granted through registration under the Trade Marks Act. Passing off, by contrast, is an equitable common law action focused on protecting established goodwill against unfair competition. In an infringement action, producing a valid registration certificate creates a strong legal presumption. In a passing off claim, however, the plaintiff must directly prove their market reputation and demonstrate actual or potential consumer deception through concrete evidence.

6. IMPORTANT JUDICIAL DECISIONS

The evolution of trademark law in India has been shaped by key decisions of the Supreme Court, which clarify how statutory rights and common law rules apply in practice:

Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd. (2001) 8: The Supreme Court highlighted the importance of market context when evaluating deceptive similarity, ruling that courts must apply strict scrutiny to pharmaceutical brands to prevent public health risks.

Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd. (2004) 14: The Court held that domain names are not merely web addresses, but function as business identifiers. Consequently, unauthorized domain names that mimic established trade names can be restricted under passing off principles.

N. R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation (1996) 15: The Supreme Court recognized the doctrine of "transborder reputation." It established that a foreign brand can protect its goodwill in India through passing off if its global reputation reached Indian consumers through international advertising, even prior to formal local sales.

Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Industries Ltd. (2017) 16: Clarifying the limits of global reputation, the Court adopted the territoriality principle. It ruled that global fame alone is insufficient for a passing off claim in India; the plaintiff must show established

ISSN: 2582-6433

goodwill within the Indian market at the time the defendant started using the mark.

These judgments show that Indian courts prioritize real-world market impact, consumer perception, and clear evidence over abstract legal comparisons.

7. REMEDIES, EVIDENCE AND PROCEDURE

Under Section 135 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, courts can grant civil remedies for both infringement and passing off. These remedies include temporary and permanent injunctions, compensatory damages, an account of profits, and orders for the delivery or destruction of infringing materials. Interim injunctions are often critical in IP litigation to stop ongoing brand damage while the main trial is pending.

Building a successful case requires organized, authentic evidence. Plaintiffs should present registration certificates, sales tax filings, historical invoices, marketing collateral, and consumer survey data. For digital claims, clear screenshots showing URLs, timestamps, and certified electronic records under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act are essential. Courts also require plaintiffs to choose between compensatory damages and an account ofprofits to avoid double recovery.

8. ONLINE MARKETPLACES AND EMERGING CHALLENGES

The rise of e-commerce and digital marketing has created new challenges for trademark enforcement. Today, brand owners routinely deal with online counterfeiting, unauthorized third-party marketplace listings, domain squatting, and search engine ad keyword bidding. Because consumers view product listings on small digital screens, subtle brand similarities can easily cause confusion.

Applying traditional trademark principles to online spaces requires careful analysis. For example, using a competitor's trademark as a keyword trigger for search engine ads may not always constitute statutory infringement, provided the ad clearly identifies its true source and does not deceive consumers. Courts must examine the ad's layout, source transparency, and user context to evaluate claims of unfair advantage.

Online platforms and e-commerce intermediaries also face questions regarding their

ISSN: 2582-6433

liability under safe-harbor rules. While modern platforms offer notice-and-takedown procedures to address IP infringement, brand owners need efficient monitoring systems to protect their marks online. At the same time, platforms must maintain balanced takedown mechanisms to prevent false or frivolous claims from restricting fair competition in the market.

9. CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

India's framework combining statutory registration with common law remedies provides robust brand protection. However, as technology evolves, brand enforcement strategies must adapt. To maintain strong brand protection, businesses and legal practitioners should consider the following approaches:

Early Registration & Documentation: Businesses should register distinct brand identifiers early and maintain organized, dated records ofsales figures, ad campaigns, and continuous market use.

Contextual Judicial Evaluation: Courts should evaluate deceptive similarity by considering real-world purchasing conditions, target consumer awareness, trade channels, and product categories.

Balanced Digital Enforcement: E-commerce platforms need fast, transparent dispute resolution systems that handle valid complaints efficiently while protecting legitimate fair use and comparative advertising.

Clear Legal Pleadings: Litigants should clearly distinguish statutory infringement claims from passing off claims in court filings, ensuring that statutory rights and market goodwill are evaluated under their proper legal standards.

10. CONCLUSION

Trademark infringement and passing off remain the cornerstone remedies for brand protection under Indian law.While statutory infringement protects exclusive registered rights under the Trade Marks Act, 1999, passing off guards established market goodwill against deceptive misrepresentation regardless of registration. Decisive Supreme Court precedents

ISSN: 2582-6433

demonstrate that courts prioritize market reality, consumer perception, and genuine commercial impact over rigid formal rules. By combining early registration with proactive market monitoring and organized record-keeping, brand owners can effectively safeguard their commercial reputation in both traditional and digital markets.

FOOTNOTES

1. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 2(1)(zb) (definition of"trade mark").
2. Trade Marks Act, 1999.
3. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 27(1)-(2).
4. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 28.
5. Trade Marks Act, 1999, ss. 30 and 34.
6. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 29.
7. See generally *Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satya Deo Gupta*, AIR 1963 SC 449; *Parle Products (P) Ltd. v. J. P. & Co.*, (1972) 1 SCC 618.
8. *Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.*, (2001) 5 SCC 73.
9. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 29(4)-(9).
10. See *Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd. v. Borden Inc.*, [1990] 1 WLR 491 (HL); *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.
11. *Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd. v. Borden Inc.*, [1990] 1 WLR 491 (HL).
12. See *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.
13. Trade Marks Act, 1999, ss. 27-30; *Cadila Health Care Ltd.*, (2001) 5 SCC 73.
14. *Satyam Infoway Ltd. v. Sifynet Solutions (P) Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.
15. *N. R. Dongre v. Whirlpool Corporation*, (1996) 5 SCC 714.
16. *Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha v. Prius Auto Industries Ltd.*, (2018) 2 SCC 1.
17. Trade Marks Act, 1999, s. 135.
18. See Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, Order XXXIX, rr. 1 -2; *Wander Ltd. v. Antox India (P) Ltd.*, 1990 Supp SCC 727.
19. See Trade Marks Act, 1999, ss. 29 and 135.
20. See *Satyam Infoway Ltd.*, (2004) 6 SCC 145.
21. Trade Marks Act, 1999, ss. 27-30, 34 and 135; *Toyota Jidosha*, (2018) 2 SCC 1.

ISSN: 2582-6433

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 (Act No. 47 of 1999, India).

The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Act No. 5 of 1908, India).

Narayanan, P., *Law ofTrade Marks and Passing Off* (6th edn, Eastern Law House 2004).

Cornish, William, David Llewelyn and Tanya Aplin, *Intellectual Property: Patents, Copyright, Trade Marks and Allied Rights* (8th edn, Sweet & Maxwell 2013).

Wadhera, B.L., *Law Relating to Intellectual Property* (5th edn, Universal Law Publishing 2014).

IJLRA