



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 14 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION



INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN – 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/>

Journal's Editorial Page – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/>

Volume 5 and Issue 14 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-14-of-2025/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 – info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in



© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer <https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/>

JUDICIAL REVIEW AND OVERREACH IN IPR: A COMPRATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRADEMARK

AUTHOR – SATWIK ARYAN, STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL, AMITY UNIVERSITY, PATNA

BEST CITATION – SATWIK ARYAN, JUDICIAL REVIEW AND OVERREACH IN IPR: A COMPRATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRADEMARK, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (14) OF 2025, PG. 39-42, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

The delicate balance between judicial activism and judicial restraint is a cornerstone of constitutional governance, particularly relevant in specialized and rapidly evolving fields like Intellectual Property Rights (IPR). This paper examines the role of **judicial review** in trademark law, focusing specifically on instances where court interventions might be perceived as **judicial overreach**, essentially interfering with the legislative and executive domains of policymaking and administration.

The study employs a comparative doctrinal analysis, focusing on trademark jurisprudence in **India and the United States**, two jurisdictions with different approaches to the separation of powers and judicial interpretation. It traces landmark case law and statutory interpretations to highlight how the boundary between legitimate judicial interpretation of trademark statutes (e.g., in cases of deceptive similarity, dilution, or non-conventional marks) and judicial legislation is often blurred in practice. The paper argues that while judicial review is a vital mechanism to protect the fundamental rights of trademark holders and consumers, an expansive exercise of this power can lead to uncertainty and a lack of clear statutory guidelines, potentially eroding the predictability of IPR enforcement.

KEYWORDS

Judicial Review, Judicial Overreach, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Trademark Law, Comparative Analysis, India, United States, Judicial Activism, Separation of Powers.

INTRODUCTION

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) form a foundational pillar of modern commercial, technological, and legal ecosystems.

Among these rights, trademark law stands out as a vital mechanism for protecting brand identity, maintaining fair competition, and safeguarding consumer interests. In a rapidly expanding global marketplace characterized by digital transactions, cross-border, e-commerce, and unprecedented accessibility to brands, trademarks ensure that businesses retain exclusive control over the symbols, names, and images representing their products or services. The Trade Marks Act, 1999

serves as the principal legislation governing trademark protection in India, replacing the earlier 1958 Act to meet international obligations under the TRIPS Agreement.

This paper offers a comprehensive study of trademark law, covering its conceptual foundation, functions, processes of registration, grounds for refusal, infringement, passing off, remedies, and modern challenges in the digital era.

CONCEPT AND DEFINITION OF TRADEMARK

The legal understanding of trademarks in India is enshrined in Section 2(zb) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

The definition covers marks capable of graphical representation and capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one person from another. This broad definition includes traditional marks such as logos, symbols, words, numerals, shapes of goods, packaging, and combinations of colours. Recent developments have further expanded the scope to encompass non-conventional marks including sound trademarks, motion marks, and holograms. These innovations reflect evolving business strategies where branding extends beyond visual elements to multisensory consumer experiences.

FUNCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF TRADEMARK LAW

Trademark law fulfills dual objectives: it protects the commercial interests of brand owners and simultaneously ensures consumer protection.

Primary functions include:

1. Identifying the origin of goods and services.
2. Ensuring consistent quality associated with a particular source.
3. Acting as an advertising and marketing tool.
4. Preventing consumer confusion and marketplace deception.
5. Creating intangible yet valuable business assets that contribute to goodwill.

As businesses increasingly rely on branding and consumer trust, trademarks evolve into symbols of credibility and reputation.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF TRADEMARK LAW

Indian trademark law has evolved significantly over the past century. Initially rooted in English common law principles of passing off, the first commercial trademark legislation in India was the Trade Marks Act of 1940. This was replaced by the more comprehensive

Trade and Merchandise Marks Act of 1958,

addressing issues of registration and protection more systematically.

The present Trade Marks Act, 1999 represents a modernized legal framework aligned with TRIPS requirements and international standards, recognizing service marks, strengthening enforcement mechanisms, and accommodating non-conventional marks.

REGISTRATION PROCESS

Trademark registration in India involves several methodical steps, beginning with a preliminary search to verify the uniqueness of the proposed mark. After filing the application online or physically, it undergoes examination by the Registrar on both absolute and relative grounds. If objections arise, the applicant must submit replies and attend hearings.

Upon acceptance, the mark is published in the Trade Marks Journal for a four-month opposition period. If no opposition is filed, or if opposition fails, the mark is registered and a certificate is issued. Registration, though not mandatory, offers significant legal advantages including statutory remedies for infringement and nationwide protection. The registration remains valid for 10 years and can be renewed indefinitely.

ABSOLUTE AND RELATIVE GROUNDS FOR REFUSAL

The Act outlines two broad categories of refusal.

Absolute grounds under Section 9 include marks lacking distinctiveness, descriptive marks, generic words, deceptive or scandalous matter, or marks that hurt religious sentiments. Relative grounds under Section 11 include similarity or identity with existing registered marks, which may cause confusion among consumers. The landmark judgment in *Cadila Healthcare Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd.* (2001) established guiding principles for determining deceptive similarity, considering factors such as the nature of goods, the class of purchasers, visual similarity, and the overall impression of the mark.

INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARKS

Infringement occurs when an unauthorized person uses a mark identical or deceptively similar to a registered trademark in the course of trade. This includes misuse in packaging, advertisements, domain names, or digital platforms.

Indian courts have consistently expanded the scope of protection. In *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora* (1999), the Delhi High Court held that domain names function as trademarks in the digital landscape and unauthorized similar domain names may constitute infringement and passing off. Infringement also includes cases of dilution, where the uniqueness of a well-known trademark is weakened even without direct competition.

PASSING OFF

Passing off is a common-law remedy available even to unregistered trademarks. It protects business goodwill from misrepresentation.

The classic trinity for proving passing off requires establishing goodwill, misrepresentation, and damage. In *N.R. Dongre v. Whirlpool*

Corporation (1996), the Supreme Court recognized trans-border reputation, granting protection even without Indian registration.

This judgment paved the way for modern recognition of global brand reputation within Indian jurisdiction.

WELL-KNOWN TRADEMARKS

Well-known trademarks enjoy broader protection under Indian law. These are marks known to a substantial segment of the public.

The Registrar maintains a list of well-known trademarks, and their protection extends across unrelated goods and services.

The *Daimler Benz v. Hybo Hindustan* (1994) case is a landmark example, where the court prevented the use of 'Benz' on unrelated goods like undergarments, emphasizing that famous trademarks deserve enhanced protection to

preserve their integrity.

REMEDIES AVAILABLE

Trademark law offers multiple remedies for infringement. Civil remedies include permanent injunctions, damages, accounts of profits, and destruction of infringing goods. Criminal remedies under Sections 103–105 impose penalties for falsification.

Administrative remedies enable customs authorities to seize infringing imported goods. These comprehensive mechanisms ensure robust protection for trademark owners.

EMERGING CHALLENGES IN TRADEMARK LAW

The digital era has introduced unprecedented challenges. Online counterfeits, e-commerce platform liabilities, keyword advertising, meta tag misuse, and domain name disputes are now frequent. New technologies such as artificial intelligence also raise questions about authorship of AI-generated logos. The recognition of non-conventional trademarks remains a developing area requiring legislative and judicial clarity.

CONCLUSION

Trademark law is a dynamic field responding continuously to developments in commerce and technology. India's legal framework under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 is robust but must continue to evolve. Strengthening enforcement, addressing digital challenges, and expanding recognition of non-conventional marks will enhance consumer protection and encourage innovation.

As businesses rely increasingly on branding, trademarks will become even more central to commercial success

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gupta, Aditya, M P Ram Mohan, and Vijay V. Venkitesh. "An Empirical Analysis of 'Scandalous' and 'Obscene' Trade Marks in India." *IIMA Working Paper* No. 2024- 04-01 (2024). (A foundational analysis for the paper mentioned above, focusing on the Indian

context).

- Malik, Kanika, and Aqa Raza. "Trademark Law Declared by the Supreme Court of India in Twentieth Century." *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights (JIPR)* 28 (2023). (Part of a series analyzing the Supreme Court's IPR jurisprudence, useful for understanding the historical scope of judicial involvement).
- Suleman, Saadiya. "Comparative Advertising, Disparagement And Trademark Infringement: An Interface." *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2011). (Relevant for analyzing judicial interpretations of trademark infringement boundaries).
- Mathur, Vrinda Saran. "Comparative Analysis of Trademark Laws in India and United Kingdom." *International Journal of Advanced Legal Research (IJALR)* Vol. 4, Issue 4. (Provides a comparative context for different legal systems).

