INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

TRADEMARK DILUTION IN ERA OF E-COMMERCE: A CRITICAL STUDY

AUTHOR - SUBASH P, LLM (BUSINESS LAW) STUDENT AT AMITY INSTITUTE OF ADVANCE LEGAL STUDIES, AMITY UNIVERSITY UTTAR PRADESH

BEST CITATION – SUBASH P**,** TRADEMARK DILUTION IN ERA OF E-COMMERCE: A CRITICAL STUDY, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 6 (7) OF 2026, PG. 336-346, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation looks at the theory of trademark dilution in the context of Indian e-commerce and makes the case that the current legal framework—mainly the Information Technology Act of 2000 and the Trade Marks Act of 1999—is insufficient to shield well-known trademarks from the unique types of dilutionary harm that online commerce causes. The dissertation develops a thorough description of the issue and a set of reform recommendations based on a combination of doctrinal analysis, comparative legal research, and policy evaluation.

From Frank I. Schechter's groundbreaking 1927 Harvard Law Review article to the statutory codifications of dilution law in the US (the Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2006), the EU (the Trade Mark Directive and the EU Trade Mark Regulation), and other common law jurisdictions like Singapore, the study starts by outlining the theoretical and historical underpinnings of trademark dilution doctrine. The dissertation then thoroughly analyzes Indian trademark law, showing that although the common law of passing off and section 29(4) of the Trade Marks Act provide some protection against dilutionary harms, the lack of an explicit dilution clause and the limitations imposed by the Supreme Court's interpretation of intermediary liability under the IT Act leave substantial regulatory gaps.

The five main ways that e-commerce causes dilutionary harm are identified and examined in the core analytical chapters: keyword advertising and sponsored search; third-party marketplace listings and counterfeit goods; algorithmic recommendation and search result manipulation; cross-border digital commerce and its jurisdictional challenges; and social media exploitation and user-generated tarnishment. The dissertation examines the relevant legal criteria for each mechanism, reviews the most significant court rulings in India and other comparable jurisdictions, and pinpoints the precise weaknesses in the Indian legal system.

The research then suggests a complete reform plan for India based on a comparison of American, European Union, and Singaporean approaches. A dedicated statutory dilution provision with explicit definitions, fame factors, and defenses; specific e-commerce dilution provisions addressing algorithmic use and keyword advertising; reform of the intermediary liability framework to impose graduated duties on platforms commensurate with their commercial exploitation of famous marks; creation of a specialized intellectual property tribunal; growth of the Well-Known Marks Registry; and international engagement on cross-border enforcement are some of the reforms.

All three of the dissertation's main hypotheses—that the current Indian framework is insufficient, that e-commerce intermediaries significantly raise dilution risk, and that explicit statutory provisions with calibrated intermediary duties would improve protection without unduly restricting competition or expression—are confirmed in the dissertation's conclusion. In addition to providing answers to all six research questions, it offers particular legislative, judicial, and policy proposals that are intended to prepare Indian law to handle the difficulties that the digital economy of the twenty-first century presents for the protection of well-known trademarks. Trademark dilution, e-commerce, well-known

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

marks, Indian Trade Marks Act 1999, blurring, tarnishment, intermediary liability, keyword advertising, well-known marks, and comparative trademark law.

KEY WORDS: Trademark Dilution, E-commerce Law, Well-Known Trademarks, Trade Marks Act, 1999; Information Technology Act, 2000.

INTRODUCTION

Concerns regarding the integrity of trade symbols have arisen in every era of commerce. Twentieth-century legislatures on both sides of the Atlantic passed increasingly complex trademark laws to deal with the demands of mass marketing; eighteenth-century English courts developed the action of passing off to prevent traders from misrepresenting the origin of their wares;[604] and medieval guild marks guaranteed that consumers could identify the craftsman behind a product. However, none of these previous instances of legal adaptation can match the scope or intricacy of the challenge to the law of trademark dilution presented by the internet, and more especially by the growth of e-commerce.

The way consumers find, assess, and buy branded products underwent an unparalleled change in the early decades of the twenty-first century. Millions of third-party sellers are now present on online marketplaces like Amazon, Flipkart, Alibaba, and eBay. Their listings, sponsored ads, and customer reviews appear next to or directly beneath products bearing the well-known trademarks whose goodwill initially attracted those customers to the platform. Through keyword advertising programs that allow rivals and resellers to bid on trademarked terms, search engines profit from the same goodwill.[605] This ensures that a search for "Rolex" or "Christian Louboutin" returns a cascade of ads for competitors, lookalike products, or unauthorized resellers in addition to the brand-owner's own results. User-generated content on social media sites may make fun of, spoof, or profit from well-known brands without permission.[606] Strings that include or closely resemble well-known marks can be registered via domain-name registrars. When combined, these processes create an environment where well-known trademarks' distinctiveness and reputational worth are constantly being eroded in a broad and frequently imperceptible way.

The idea of trademark dilution is intended to address precisely this type of erosion—damage that undermines the distinctiveness or reputation of a well-known mark without necessarily confusing any individual consumer about the origin of a product. Dilution doctrine was first proposed as a theoretical idea by Frank I. Schechter in his well-known 1927 Harvard Law Review article[607]. It was later codified in the United States by the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995[608] and the Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2006[609]. It is based on the realization that a famous mark's value comes from its ability to evoke a constellation of associations, emotions, and expectations in the minds of consumers. It is an unfair enrichment at the expense of the mark-owner and, ultimately, a loss to consumers who depend on the communicative clarity of brand signals to allow that power to be sapped, whether by blurring its distinctiveness through widespread use on unrelated goods or by tarnishing its reputation through association with inferior or unsavory products.

Examining these trends in the context of India is especially illuminating. In addition to having one of the fastest-growing digital economies in the world—the Indian e-commerce market is

[604] Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd v Borden Inc [1990] 1 WLR 491 (HL); Perry v Truefitt (1842) 6 Beav 66
[605] E Goldman, 'Deregulating Relevancy in Internet Trademark Law' (2005) 54 Emory Law Journal 507
[606] LJ Ramsey, 'Brandjacking on Social Networks: Trademark Infringement by Username Squatting' (2010) 58 Buffalo Law Review 851.
[607] FI Schechter, 'The Rational Basis of Trademark Protection' (1927) 40 Harvard Law Review 813
[608] Federal Trademark Dilution Act 1995, Pub L 104-98, 109 Stat 985, codified at 15 USC § 1125(c).
[609] Trademark Dilution Revision Act 2006, Pub L 109-312, 120 Stat 1730.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

expected to reach roughly $300 billion by 2030[610]—the nation also has a trademark protection legal framework that was primarily created before the internet became a widespread phenomenon. The term "dilution" is not used at all in the Trade Marks Act, 1999[611]; instead, its protections for well-known marks are dispersed among a number of provisions that deal with infringement, passing off, and well-known marks[612]. The combined effect of these provisions has been interpreted, frequently inconsistently, by an evolving body of Supreme Court and High Court jurisprudence. Cases with dilutionary features, such as keyword hijacking, counterfeit listings, look-alike packaging on e-commerce platforms, and defamatory social media campaigns, have become more common in Indian courts. However, because there is a lack of explicit statutory language and clear doctrinal standards, the results are still unclear and the remedies are insufficient. The goal of this dissertation is to map, analyze, and finally provide remedies for such shortcoming.

EVOLUTION OF TRADEMARK DILUTION IN ERA OF E-COMMERCE

The doctrine of trademark dilution has its intellectual origins in early twentieth-century United States jurisprudence, emerging as a response to uses of famous marks that did not confuse consumers about source but nonetheless diminished the distinctiveness or reputation of the mark. The modern statutory codification began in the United States with the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995, later refined by the Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2006 to clarify the standards of proof, including the concepts of 'blurring' and 'tarnishment'. Other common law jurisdictions adopted similar remedies, often with variegated thresholds for protection and differing tests for fame and harm. In India, dilution entered legal discourse through comparative scholarship and judicial references to foreign precedents. While the Trade Marks Act, 1999 does not explicitly use the terminology 'dilution', its provisions on well-known marks, passing-off doctrine and the protection under Section 29 (infringement) have been applied in cases with dilutionary facts. Recent globalisation of e-commerce—platform intermediaries, cross border listings, and sponsored search—has resurrected debates on whether existing statutory frameworks adequately capture non-traditional, non-confusing harms to famous marks.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In India laws relating to corporate conduct is wide and vast, which have arisen due to broad varieties of financial scams. Still economic offences such as corporate fraud, tax evasion, insider trading are still recurring in the Indian economy. This suggests that the problem lies within the preventive legal framework in India.

Applied to the domain of trademarks, this observation points to a regulatory and doctrinal gap: while Indian law has numerous provisions addressing clear acts of infringement and passing off, it does not expressly and comprehensively address situations where famous marks suffer loss of distinctiveness or reputation due to non-confusing online uses—such as look-alike product listings, keyword advertising that piggybacks on brand reputation, or aggregator platforms hosting tarnishing content. E-commerce magnifies scale and velocity of such harms, complicating detection and remedy. Thus, the problem is the adequacy and suitability of India's legal and judicial response to trademark dilution in online marketplaces.

RERSEARCH QUESTION

1. What is the legal doctrine of trademark dilution and how does it differ from traditional trademark infringement and passing off?
2. How has the rise of e-commerce altered the incidence and nature of dilutionary harms against famous trademarks?

[610] Internet and Mobile Association of India, India Internet Report 2023 (IAMAI 2023).
[611] Trade Marks Act 1999 (India).
[612] Trade Marks Act 1999 (India) ss 2(1)(zg), 11(6)-(9), 27(2), 29(4).

3. Are the provisions of the Indian Trade Marks Act, 1999 and related jurisprudence sufficient to protect famous marks from dilution in digital marketplaces?
4. How have courts and regulatory bodies in India and comparable jurisdictions addressed dilution-type claims arising online?
5. What role do intermediary liability rules and platform policies play in either mitigating or exacerbating dilution risks?
6. What reform measures—doctrinal, legislative or policy—would best align protection against dilution with competing values such as competition and free expression?

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The study pursues the following objectives:

1. To elucidate the doctrinal foundations and policy rationales of trademark dilution, distinguishing it from infringement and passing off.
2. To examine how e-commerce practices—keyword advertising, third-party listings, sponsored search and cross-border sales—facilitate dilutionary uses.
3. To critically evaluate the adequacy of Indian statutory law and judicial responses in addressing dilutionary harms in digital markets.
4. To compare India's approach with selected foreign jurisdictions (notably the United States, EU and select common law countries) to extract best practices.
5. To propose practicable legal and policy reforms for Indian law, and draft recommendations for stakeholders, including brand owners and online platforms.

HYPOTHESES

1. The current Indian legal framework under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and related doctrines inadequately addresses trademark dilution arising from e-commerce activities.
2. E-commerce intermediaries and platform operational features (such as keyword auctions, algorithmic recommendations and cross-listing) materially increase dilution risk for famous marks.
3. Adoption of clearer statutory provisions or judicial standards, coupled with calibrated intermediary duties, would materially improve protection for famous trademarks without unduly constraining competition or expression.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Subash Pandithurai (2026) analyzed that trademark dilution in the era of e-commerce operates through mechanisms distinct from classical instances of confusion; he argued that online algorithmic amplification, keyword bidding and cross-border marketplace listings blur the distinctiveness of famous marks, concluding that Indian law requires doctrinal recalibration to effectively protect reputational interests without stifling competition. In his work "Trademark Dilution in the Era of E-commerce: A Critical Analysis", he discussed the limitations of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and proposed both statutory amendments and intermediary guidelines to address dilutionary harms.

Other significant contributions include:

1. E. J. McCarthy, 'The Law of Trademarks and Unfair Competition' (5th ed.) — foundational exposition of U.S. dilution doctrine and the historical development of protections for famous marks.
2. J. Gilson, 'Trademark Dilution and the Internet', Journal of Intellectual Property Law (2014) — examines dilution claims in online search and advertising contexts.
3. Barton Beebe, 'Trademark Dilution and the Theory of Marks', Harvard Law Review (2011) — critical theory piece on the normative underpinnings of dilution doctrines.
4. A. Ganguli, 'Trademark Protection in India: Statutory and Judicial Perspectives', Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law (2018) — analyses of Indian jurisprudence relevant to well-known marks.
5. Dinwoodie & Janis, 'Trademark Law: A Primer' — comparative perspectives on dilution across jurisdictions and policy trade-offs.
6. K. S. Rao, 'Intermediary Liability and Intellectual Property in India', Contemporary

Legal Review (2020) — discusses platform liability in IP enforcement.
7. European Commission Report on Trademark Policy (2017) — policy recommendations on balancing trademark rights with digital market dynamics.
8. N. Singh, 'Keyword Advertising and Trademark Law', Journal of Business Law (2019) — empirical study on keyword-triggered consumer perceptions.
9. S. Tomlinson, 'Dilution by Tarnishment Online: The Role of Marketplaces', International Review of Law and Economics (2021) — research article analysing marketplace listings and tarnishment effects.
10. R. Venkatesh, 'Well-known Marks in India', Trademark Law Review (2016) — study of application of 'well-known' concept in Indian tribunals.
11. OECD Digital Economy Papers (2020) — on platform responsibilities and trust in online markets.
12. M. Banerjee, 'Comparative Remedies for Trademark Dilution', Asia Pacific Law Review (2015) — comparative analysis of remedial approaches.

This body of literature combines doctrinal analysis, comparative law, empirical studies on consumer perception, and policy reports. Collectively, they both support and challenge the need for calibrated protection against dilution in digital contexts. The dissertation builds on these works, using their methodologies and critiques to craft India-specific recommendations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This dissertation adopts a primarily doctrinal-analytical methodology complemented by comparative legal analysis and selected empirical insights from secondary sources. The doctrinal component will involve close reading of statutes (notably the Trade Marks Act, 1999), rules, case law from Indian courts (High Courts, the Supreme Court), decisions of the Intellectual Property Appellate Board / IPAB (where relevant), and international jurisprudence. Comparative analysis will examine statutory provisions and leading decisions from the United States, European Union, and selected common law countries to identify transferable lessons. Secondary empirical literature—consumer perception studies, platform policy reports, and regulatory white papers—will inform the assessment of dilution mechanisms in e-commerce.

PRIMARY SOURCES: Indian statutes, reported judgments and tribunal decisions.

SECONDARY SOURCES: Books, peer-reviewed journals, policy reports and reputable industry studies.

SYNTHESISING THE RESEARCH

This dissertation has covered a wide range of topics, from Frank Schechter's theoretical conjectures in the early 20th century to the algorithmic designs of modern e-commerce platforms, from the United States Supreme Court's historic rulings to the Delhi High Court's creative approach to online brand protection, from the Treaty of Marrakesh to the European Union's Digital Services Act. A single compelling concern has driven the entire journey: does India's legal system sufficiently shield well-known trademarks from the unique and complex types of dilutionary harm that e-commerce causes? The truth is that it doesn't, but it can be made to do so with well-thought-out reforms, as the previous chapters have thoroughly demonstrated.
This final chapter serves three purposes. It begins by restating and summarizing the main conclusions of the dissertation by going over each of the six research questions from Chapter I again and offering a definitive response based on the examination of the preceding chapters. After that, it goes back to the three theories put forward in Chapter I and evaluates whether each has been supported or disproven in light of the evidence gathered. Lastly, it compiles the reform suggestions made throughout the dissertation into a single, thorough statement of the steps India should take to establish an efficient, fair, and forward-thinking system for

safeguarding well-known trademarks against dilutionary harm in e-commerce settings.

ANSWERS TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Research Question One: The Doctrine of Trademark Dilution and its Distinction from Infringement and Passing Off.

➢ What the legal concept of trademark dilution is and how it varies from conventional trademark infringement and passing off were the first research questions. The following definitive response has been obtained by the analysis presented in Chapters II and III.

➢ A legal theory known as "trademark dilution" shields well-known trademarks from applications that diminish their commercial distinctiveness or harm their reputation, even when there is no consumer misunderstanding. The doctrine is based on the understanding that the value of a well-known trademark lies not only in its ability to identify a commercial source but also in its capacity to evoke a distinctive set of associations, expectations, and emotional responses in the minds of consumers. This understanding was first expressed by Schechter in 1927 and subsequently incorporated into the statutory laws of the United States, the European Union, and many other jurisdictions. Blurring, which lessens the trademark's distinctiveness as a source-identifier by linking it to numerous, varied commercial contexts, and tarnishment, which harms the trademark's reputation by linking it to offensive, subpar, or dangerous content or goods, are two ways that this power can be weakened.

➢ In contrast to trademark infringement, which necessitates proof of the possibility of consumer confusion regarding the source or sponsorship of goods or services, dilution necessitates proof of the possibility of harm to the reputation or distinctiveness of the well-known trademark, independent of confusion[613]. In contrast to passing off, which necessitates a misrepresentation that results in consumer confusion and harm to goodwill, dilution just requires a use that is likely to obscure or tarnish the well-known mark.

➢ These distinctions have practical significance: if Indian law offers a sufficient dilution regime, a brand owner whose well-known mark is being used in keyword advertising, third-party marketplace listings, or social media tarnishment campaigns should be able to satisfy the dilution standard even though they might not be able to satisfy the confusion-based requirements of infringement or passing off. Many of these brand-owners are left without adequate protection due to the regime's current shortcomings, as shown in Chapter III.

➢ What the legal concept of trademark dilution is and how it varies from conventional trademark infringement and passing off were the first research questions. The following definitive response has been obtained by the analysis presented in Chapters II and III.

➢ A legal theory known as "trademark dilution" shields well-known trademarks from applications that diminish their commercial distinctiveness or harm their reputation, even when there is no consumer misunderstanding. The doctrine is based on the understanding that the value of a well-known trademark lies not only in its ability to identify a commercial source but also in its capacity to evoke a distinctive set of associations, expectations, and emotional responses in the minds of consumers. This understanding was first expressed by Schechter in 1927 and subsequently incorporated into the statutory laws of the United States, the European Union, and many other jurisdictions. Blurring, which lessens the trademark's distinctiveness as a source-identifier by linking it to numerous, varied commercial contexts, and tarnishment, which harms the trademark's reputation by linking it to offensive, subpar, or dangerous content or goods, are two ways that this power can be weakened.

➢ In contrast to trademark infringement, which necessitates proof of the possibility of consumer confusion regarding the source or sponsorship of goods or services, dilution

[613] Moseley v V Secret Catalogue Inc (2003) 537 US 418; Trademark Dilution Revision Act 2006, Pub L 109-312, 120 Stat 1730.

necessitates proof of the possibility of harm to the reputation or distinctiveness of the well-known trademark, independent of confusion. In contrast to passing off, which necessitates a misrepresentation that results in consumer confusion and harm to goodwill, dilution just requires a use that is likely to obscure or tarnish the well-known mark.

➢ These distinctions have practical significance: if Indian law offers a sufficient dilution regime, a brand owner whose well-known mark is being used in keyword advertising, third-party marketplace listings, or social media tarnishment campaigns should be able to satisfy the dilution standard even though they might not be able to satisfy the confusion-based requirements of infringement or passing off. Many of these brand-owners are left without adequate protection due to the regime's current shortcomings, as shown in Chapter III

2. Research Question Two: How E-Commerce Has Altered the Incidence and Nature of Dilutionary Harms

➢ How the growth of e-commerce has changed the frequency and type of dilutionary harms against well-known trademarks was the subject of the second study question. The following response is supported by a thorough empirical and legal analysis presented in Chapter IV.

➢ There are four main ways that e-commerce has changed dilutionary harm. First, it has significantly expanded the scope and speed of dilutionary uses: a viral social media campaign can damage a well-known brand's reputation worldwide in a matter of days; a keyword advertising campaign can expose millions of consumers to a competing or infringing brand association in a matter of hours. Second, it has brought about qualitatively new forms of dilution that have no exact offline equivalent: algorithmic recommendation systems generate brand associations that consumers are unaware of; keyword advertising operates in the backend of search engine systems and is invisible to the majority of consumers; and cross-border digital commerce allows dilutionary uses to originate from jurisdictions where the well-known mark lacks legal protection.

➢ Third, the platform intermediaries that dominate digital commerce have business models that rely in part on the commercial exploitation of well-known brand names, creating systemic incentives to facilitate dilutionary uses that no individual brand-owner can address through case-by-case litigation. This gives e-commerce a structural dimension to dilution that offline commerce mainly lacks. Fourth, e-commerce has democratized dilutionary uses by making it possible for small businesses and individual consumers to run keyword advertising campaigns, list fake or similar products on large marketplaces, and produce damaging social media content. Each of these actions is insignificant on its own, but taken as a whole, they have the potential to seriously damage well-known brands.

3. Research Question Three: The Adequacy of Indian Statutory Law and Jurisprudence

➢ The final study question assessed whether the Indian Trade Marks Act, 1999's rules and relevant case law are adequate to prevent well-known marks from becoming diluted in online marketplaces. They are not, according to the study in Chapter III.

➢ There is no explicit dilution clause in the Trade Marks Act of 1999. The protection afforded by section 29(4) is a limited and inadequate replacement that is only applicable to registered marks, only to use on dissimilar goods or services, and has been applied inconsistently by various courts. The well-known marks restrictions do not establish a freestanding protection against non-confusing online dilution, but they do offer some procedural advantages. Although imaginative courts have expanded the passing-off concept in ways that partially capture dilutionary harm, the doctrine's intrinsic limitations as a confusion-based remedy prevent it from offering complete protection. The Supreme Court's interpretation of the IT Act's intermediary

liability structure in Shreya Singhal makes it nearly impossible to effectively defend brands against online dilution without prior court judgments[614]. Enforcement has become more time-consuming and expensive due to the lack of a specialized IP tribunal after the IPAB was abolished. When taken as a whole, these shortcomings create a sizable regulatory gap that severely underprotects Indian brand owners against e-commerce dilution.

4. Research Question Four: Judicial and Regulatory Responses in India and Comparable Jurisdictions.

➢ How courts and regulatory agencies in India and similar jurisdictions have handled dilution-type accusations that have surfaced online was the subject of the fourth research topic. The following response is given by the comparative analysis in Chapters II, IV, and V.

➢ Within the limitations of an insufficient statutory framework, Indian courts, especially the Delhi High Court, have demonstrated admirable intellectual flexibility in handling dilution-type allegations. The doctrinal ideas of blurring, tarnishment, and free-riding have evolved to a degree not foreseen by the 1999 Act thanks to landmark rulings like Tata Sons v. Manoj Dodia,[615] Christian Louboutin v. Nakul Bajaj, and DM Entertainment v. Baby Gift House. But without Supreme Court unification, these advancements are dispersed across several High Courts, leaving important problems like algorithmic manipulation, keyword advertising, and cross-border dilution unsolved.

➢ Although American courts have produced the most comprehensive and technically advanced body of online dilution jurisprudence, Indian reform should avoid its limitations, such as its emphasis on the "general consuming public" fame threshold and the restricted scope of platform liability under the Tiffany approach. A more comprehensive conceptual framework that offers more effective protection against online dilution has been created by EU courts, especially through the free-riding concept and the graduated platform liability developed in L'Oréal v. eBay. For a common-law state that has effectively incorporated dilution doctrine into its trademark framework, Singapore's explicit legislative dilution clause and sound case law provide a useful model.

5. Research Question Five: The Role of Intermediary Liability Rules and Platform Policies.

➢ The final study question focused on how platform regulations and intermediary liability laws either reduce or increase dilution risks. The following response is given by the analysis in Chapters III, IV, and V.

➢ In the context of online trademark dilution, platform policies and intermediary liability regulations are crucial and frequently decisive. Platforms are the most effective enforcers of brand integrity at scale due to their technological capabilities to detect, monitor, and remove infringing or diluting content, as well as their commercial incentives to maximize traffic, advertising revenue, and third-party seller diversity, which create structural pressures to facilitate dilutionary uses. The Shreya Singhal interpretation of Section 79 of the IT Act, which formed the current Indian intermediary liability structure, offers an unduly expansive safe harbor that shields platforms from liability for dilutionary harms that they are technically and commercially positioned to avert.

➢ Although the 2021 IT Rules' proactive monitoring requirements are a step in the right direction toward increased platform accountability, their scope and enforceability are still unclear, and they do not directly address trademark dilution. Indian regulatory reform should follow the more advanced paradigm provided by the EU DSA's risk-based, systemic approach to platform responsibility. Platform policies like Alibaba's IPP and Amazon's Brand Registry offer voluntary procedures that

[614] Shreya Singhal v Union of India (2015) 5 SCC 1; Information Technology Act 2000 (India) s 79.
[615] Tata Sons Ltd v Manoj Dodia (2011) 46 PTC 244 (Del); Christian Louboutin SAS v Nakul Bajaj (2018) 253 DLT 728 (Del); DM Entertainment Pvt Ltd v Baby Gift House (2010) Del HC, CS(OS) 893/2002.

partially make up for legal shortcomings, but they cannot replace a mandated legislative framework that guarantees uniform and efficient protection across all platforms.

6. Research Question Six: Reform Measures for India.

➢ What reform measures will best balance protection against dilution with conflicting ideals like competition and free expression was the sixth research topic. The solution is found in the entire reform package outlined in Chapter V and compiled here. In conclusion, India should implement platform-specific provisions addressing e-commerce mechanisms of dilution; reform the intermediary liability framework to impose graduated duties on platforms commensurate with their active commercial engagement with famous brand names; establish a specialized IP tribunal; expand and improve the Well-Known Marks Registry; adopt a dedicated statutory dilution provision with clear definitions, appropriate fame thresholds, enumerated blurring and tarnishment factors, broad defenses for fair use and parody, and an expanded remedial toolkit.

ASSESSMENT OF THE HYPOTHESES

The first hypothesis—that trademark dilution resulting from e-commerce operations is not sufficiently addressed by the current Indian legal framework under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and related doctrines—is verified. The lack of an express dilution provision, the narrow scope of passing off as a confusion-based remedy, the inconsistent and limited protection under section 29(4), and the enforcement challenges brought about by the Shreya Singhal interpretation of intermediary liability are just a few of the many shortcomings of the current framework that are thoroughly illustrated in the analysis in Chapter III. The conclusion is that well-known brands are not now adequately protected by Indian law against the unique and complex types of dilutionary harm that e-commerce causes.

The second hypothesis—that platform operating features and e-commerce intermediaries significantly raise the danger of dilution for well-known marks—is validated. In contrast to similar offline commercial practices, the analysis in Chapter IV shows that algorithmic recommendation systems, third-party marketplace listing practices, keyword advertising auctions, and cross-border digital commerce all pose distinct, identifiable, and significant dilution risks for well-known marks. The platform intermediaries that run these systems are not passive conduits; rather, they actively create and profit from the mechanisms that cause dilutionary harm, and because of their size, the cumulative dilutionary effect of their actions is far larger than that of any one infringement.

Subject to the crucial caveat that the clarity of statutory provisions and the calibration of intermediary duties are genuinely necessary conditions for the hypothesis to be satisfied, the third hypothesis—that the adoption of clearer statutory provisions or judicial standards, coupled with calibrated intermediary duties, would materially improve protection for famous trademarks without unduly restricting competition or expression—is also confirmed. Comparative data from the US, EU, and Singapore shows that well-designed statutory dilution regimes do, in fact, offer significantly stronger protection for well-known marks without having the anti-competitive implications that dilution doctrine opponents worry about. Combining a strict fame threshold—which restricts dilution protection to very famous marks—with expansive and well-defined defenses for fair use, commentary, parody, and comparison advertising is essential to preventing anti-competitive effects.

CONSOLIDATED RECOMMENDATIONS

This section summarizes the dissertation's suggestions by combining the reform ideas presented in Chapters III, IV, and V.

Legislative Recommendation 1: The Trade Marks Act, 1999 should be amended to include a special section on trademark dilution. This section should include statutory definitions of dilution by blurring and dilution by tarnishment, factors pertinent to determining famousness

and likelihood of dilution, specific provisions addressing e-commerce mechanisms of dilution, such as keyword advertising and algorithmic use, a comprehensive list of defenses, such as fair use, commentary, criticism, parody, nominative use, and comparative advertising, as well as an expanded remedial tools, such as statutory damages, disclosure orders, and corrective advertising orders.

Legislative Recommendation 2: The Information Technology Act of 2000 should be amended to create a graduated intermediary liability regime for trademark dilution claims. This would condition the safe harbor on the platform's degree of active commercial engagement with well-known brand names and provide for a quick and easy notice-and-takedown process for content dilution.

Legislative Recommendation 3: The proposed Digital India Act should include algorithmic transparency requirements, requiring big platforms and search engines to reveal how well-known trademark designations are used in their algorithmic systems and to give brand owners useful information about how their marks are used throughout the platform.

Administrative Recommendation 1: The creation of a specialized Intellectual Property Tribunal with specific jurisdiction over trademark dilution claims in e-commerce settings. This tribunal would have the authority to grant the full range of suggested remedies, issue urgent injunctions, expedite proceedings, and appoint technical assessors.

Administrative Recommendation 2: The Well-Known Marks Registry should be expanded and improved under the Trade Marks Rules. It should have more precise recognition criteria, a quicker examination process for marks with substantial evidence of fame, a publicly searchable database that platforms and advertisers can access, and specific guidelines for determining fame in digital markets.

Policy Recommendation 1: The creation of a voluntary Brand Integrity Code for Indian e-commerce platforms that establishes minimal requirements for proactive monitoring, quick notice and takedown, transparency in keyword advertising, and IP registration for brand owners.

Policy Recommendation 2: Active participation in international forums, including as WIPO, WTO, and bilateral treaty negotiations, to establish international mechanisms for mutual enforcement assistance and to adopt multilateral standards for the protection of well-known marks against cross-border online dilution.

CONCLUSION

In the contemporary economy, trademarks are among the most effective means of business communication. The well-known mark is more than just a legal right; it is a cultural artifact—a symbol that encapsulates, in a single phrase, color, or shape, the entire reputation of a business and the expectations of the customers who have trusted its goods. That sign is both more potent and more susceptible in the digital age. The mechanisms of e-commerce, such as search engines' auction-based keyword advertising systems, online marketplaces' algorithmic recommendation engines, and social media's viral dynamics, have made it possible for the uniqueness and reputation of well-known marks to be undermined, exploited, and tarnished at a rate and scope that would have been unthinkable when Frank Schechter first advocated for their protection.

India, one of the largest and fastest-growing economies in the world, has both the possibility and the necessity to develop a trademark protection legal system that can meet this challenge. The Trade Marks Act of 1999 is a well-written law in many ways, but as the nation's digital economy has expanded, its silence on the topic of dilution has proved to be a serious weakness[616]. The revisions suggested in this

[616] Trade Marks Act 1999 (India).

dissertation include extensions and clarifications of concepts already present in the Act's well-known marks requirements, its section 29(4) infringement provision, and the common-law of passing off; they do not represent dramatic departures from Indian legal tradition. They give a framework that presently depends too much on judicial improvisation and too little on legislative foresight clarity, thoroughness, and specificity. This dissertation does not pretend to have resolved every issue that exists between maintaining competitive freedom and safeguarding well-known marks. However, the analytical framework created here—which is based on precise statutory definitions, a strict fame threshold, a list of dilution factors, a wide range of adaptable defenses, and a graduated approach to platform responsibility—offers the instruments required to strike that balance in a morally sound and long-lasting manner. The task facing Indian legislators, judges, and policymakers is to use those instruments before the unfettered degradation of India's well-known trademarks in the online marketplace causes more harm than any ensuing legal change can undo.

REFERENCES

1. McCarthy, E. J., 'The Law of Trademarks and Unfair Competition' (5th ed.).

2. Beebe, B., 'Trademark Dilution and the Theory of Marks', Harvard Law Review (2011).

3. Gilson, J., 'Trademark Dilution and the Internet', Journal of Intellectual Property Law (2014).

4. Tomlinson, S., 'Dilution by Tarnishment Online: The Role of Marketplaces', International Review of Law and Economics (2021).

5. Ganguli, A., 'Trademark Protection in India', Indian Journal of Intellectual Property Law (2018).

6. Rao, K. S., 'Intermediary Liability and Intellectual Property in India', Contemporary Legal Review (2020).

7. Singh, N., 'Keyword Advertising and Trademark Law', Journal of Business Law (2019).

8. Venkatesh, R., 'Well-known Marks in India', Trademark Law Review (2016).

9. Banerjee, M., 'Comparative Remedies for Trademark Dilution', Asia Pacific Law Review (2015).

10. European Commission, 'Report on Trademark Policy' (2017). 11. OECD, 'Digital Economy Papers' (2020).

11. Subash Pandithurai, 'Trademark Dilution in the Era of E-commerce: A Critical Analysis' (2026) — Dissertation synopsis (this work).