

**By Email/DoT Website**

**Government of India  
Ministry of Communications  
Department of Telecommunications  
Sanchar Bhawan, 20, Ashoka Road, New Delhi - 110 001  
(Data Service Cell)**

No. 813-07/LM/2024-DS-II

Dated:15-04-2025

**To,  
All Licensees with Internet Service Authorization**

**Subject: CS (COMM) 332 of 2025: FASHNEAR TECHNOLOGIES PRIVATE LIMITED versus JOHN DOE/S AND ORS in the High Court of Delhi.**

Kindly find enclosed the Hon'ble Delhi High Court order dated **09.04.2025** in the captioned suit.

2. Please refer to **Para 39(h)** of the said Court order with regard to blocking of access to the websites [ **23 nos.**], as received from the Counsel of the Plaintiff vide email dated 11.04.2025.

3. In view of the above, all Licensees with Internet Service Authorization are hereby instructed to take immediate necessary action with regard to blocking of access to the said websites, as above, in compliance with the said court order.

**Encl: A/A**

Digitally signed by  
SHASHI KUMAR  
Date: 15-04-2025  
18:57:10  
**Director (DS-II)**  
Email: dirds2-dot@nic.in

**Copy to:**

- i) DG Telecom, DoT, New Delhi; Requested to arrange to block access to the phone numbers as per **Para 39(h)** of the said Court order. Details of such phone numbers [ **6 nos**] received from the Counsel of the Plaintiff vide email dated 11.04.2025 is enclosed herewith.
- ii) Sh. V. Chinnasamy, Scientist E (chinnasamy.v@meity.gov.in), Electronics Niketan, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY), New Delhi for kind information and with request to take action as per the Annexure pl.
- iii.) Sh. Ritwik Marwaha (Ritwik@fiduslawchambers.com), Counsel for the Plaintiff; for kind information and requested to take action as per the Annexure pl.
- iv) IT Wing of DoT for uploading this order on DoT websites pl.

**RE: FASHNEAR TECHNOLOGIES PRIVATE LIMITED v. JOHN DOE AND ORS.; C.S. (COMM.)  
NO. 332/2025 - COMPLIANCE UNDER ORDER XXXIX RULE 3 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL  
PROCEDURE, 1908**

**RM** Ritwik Marwaha <Ritwik@fiduslawchambers.com>  
Fri, 11 Apr 2025 6:18:27 PM +0530 •

To "Secy-dot" <secy-dot@nic.in>, "Shashi Kumar" <dirds2-dot@nic.in>, "uoidhc" <uoidhc@gmail.com>, "Abhinesh Meena" <abhinesh.meena@gov.in>, "Cyberlaw and eSecurity.MeitY" <cyberlaw@meity.gov.in>, "gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in" <gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in>, "Pkumar" <pkumar@meity.gov.in>, "uoidhc" <uoidhc@gmail.com>

Cc "Prithvi Singh" <prithvi@fiduslawchambers.com>, "Rohan Krishna Seth" <rohan@fiduslawchambers.com>, "Prithvi Gulati" <prithvi.gulati@fiduslawchambers.com>

---

To,

Department of Telecommunications  
Through its Secretary,  
Ministry of Communications and IT,  
20, Sanchar Bhawan, Ashoka Road,  
New Delhi-110001

E-mail: [secy-dot@nic.in](mailto:secy-dot@nic.in);  
[dirds2-dot@nic.in](mailto:dirds2-dot@nic.in);  
[uoidhc@gmail.com](mailto:uoidhc@gmail.com);  
[abhinesh.meena@gov.in](mailto:abhinesh.meena@gov.in)

? Defendant No. 19

Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology  
Through the Director General (DIT) Cyber Laws  
Electronics Niketan, 6-CGO Complex,  
Lodhi Road, New Delhi-110003

E-mail: [cyberlaw@meity.gov.in](mailto:cyberlaw@meity.gov.in);  
[gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in](mailto:gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in);  
[pkumar@meity.gov.in](mailto:pkumar@meity.gov.in);  
[uoidhc@gmail.com](mailto:uoidhc@gmail.com)

? Defendant No. 20

Dear Sirs,

As you are aware, that the Plaintiff have instituted a suit for permanent injunction for trademark and copyright infringement, rendition of accounts, damages, delivery up, etc. wherein you have been impleaded as Defendants. The suit was listed before Hon<sup>ble</sup> Mr. Justice Amit Bansal of the Delhi High Court on **09<sup>th</sup> April 2025**. On the said date, the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Court was pleased to pass an *ex-parte ad-interim* injunction in favour of the Plaintiff (copy of the Order dt. 09.04.2025 attached). The effective portion of the Order is reproduced below:

*?39. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, the following directions are issued:*

*?*

*h. Defendants no.19 (Department of Telecommunications) and 20 (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology) are directed to issue necessary notifications/directions to all telecom and internet service providers to suspend access to all the websites as identified in paragraph 22 and phone numbers identified in paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.*

40. Defendants are directed to comply with the above directions within a period of 10 days.?

\*Kindly note: It appears that the highlighted text above is a typographical error and should be read as paragraph 26.

In view of the above you are directed to issue necessary notifications/directions to all telecom and internet service providers to suspend access to all the websites as identified in paragraph 22 and phone numbers identified in paragraph 26 of the interim injunction application, within 10 days in compliance with the order dated 09<sup>th</sup> April 2025.

For the sake of convenience, please find the table below as mentioned in the paragraph 26 of the interim injunction application:

Paragraph 22:

S. No.	Domain Names	Domain Name Registrars
i.	meesho-valmo.in	GoDaddy.com, LLC (Defendant No. 2)
ii.	valmo.org.in	
iii.	valmologisticpartner.in	
iv.	valmofranchise.in	
v.	valmologisticpartners.in	
vi.	valmo-logistics.in	
vii.	valmologisticspartner.in	
viii.	valmologisticpartners.in	
ix.	valmologisticpartner.in	
x.	valmofranchise.co	
xi.	valmologisticpartners.in	
xii.	getvalmo.store	HOSTINGER operations, UAB (Defendant No. 3)
xiii.	valmodelivery.ind.in	
xiv.	valmodelivery.in	
xv.	valmodeliverys.in	
xvi.	valmologisticspartnar.in	
xvii.	valmocourier.in	
xviii.	valmologistics.ind.in	
xix.	valmologisticspartnar.in	
xx.	valmofranchise.co.in	Endurance Digital Domain Technology Private Limited (Defendant No. 4)
xxi.	valmocourierfrenchise.in	
xxii.	valmofranchise.info	PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (Defendant No. 5)
xxiii.	valmo.life	BigRock Solutions Ltd (Defendant No. 6)

Paragraph 26:

S. No.	Phone Numbers	Telecom Service Providers
i.	+91-9244394126	Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited (Defendant No.15)
ii.	+91-6265489940	
iii.	+91-6269596717	Vodafone Idea Limited (Defendant No. 16)
iv.	+91-9919359675	
v.	+91-9661385744	Bharti Airtel Limited (Defendant No. 17)
vi.	+91-8962451086	

The complete set of suit paper-book (including the Complaint, all interlocutory applications and the documents) for the captioned suit can be accessed from the Google Drive link: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1hDN8EKk-hp9OXW3JSnuSnOFrKMXCiYzi?usp=sharing>

**(Please note that the link has an open access and is not password protected)**

The matter is now listed before the Ld. Joint Registrar on **21<sup>st</sup> July 2025** and before the Hon'ble Court on **22<sup>nd</sup> September 2025**.

Sincerely,

Ritwik Marwaha  
Advocate for the Plaintiff

**Ritwik Marwaha (He/Him)**

F-12, Sector 8 NOIDA 201301 || w +91 120.4847550 || f +91 120.4847551 || w <https://www.fiduslawchambers.com>



**An ISO 9001:2015 & ISO/IEC 27001:2013 certified firm**



This e-mail and any files/attachments transmitted with it are confidential to the intended recipient(s) and contains privileged information. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately contact the sender and delete the e-mail and any files/attachments from your system without reading, copying or disseminating it/them.

**India Business Law Journal ? Award Winning Law Firm**

**Legal 500 ? Leading Firm | Client Satisfaction**

**Chambers Asia Pacific ? Leading Firm**

**World Trademark Review (WTR) 1000 - Gold Band ? Litigation & Enforcement | Silver Band ? Trademark Prosecution**

**Managing Intellectual Property (MIP) World IP Survey | IP Stars ? Ranked Firm**

**INTA Members for a Better Society ? Winner**

**Vahura ? Best Law Firms to Work (Top 10 in India)**

---

**From:** Ritwik Marwaha

**Sent:** 07 April 2025 18:44

**To:** [grievanceofficer@godaddy.com](mailto:grievanceofficer@godaddy.com); [abuse@hostinger.com](mailto:abuse@hostinger.com); [compliance@edtpl.in](mailto:compliance@edtpl.in); [PublicDomainRegistry.com](mailto:PublicDomainRegistry.com) <[abuse@publicdomainregistry.com](mailto:abuse@publicdomainregistry.com)>; [grievance-officer@publicdomainregistry.com](mailto:grievance-officer@publicdomainregistry.com); [PublicDomainRegistry.com](mailto:PublicDomainRegistry.com) Compliance Team <[Compliance@publicdomainregistry.com](mailto:Compliance@publicdomainregistry.com)>; BigRock <[grievance-officer@bigrock.com](mailto:grievance-officer@bigrock.com)>; Pno <[PNO@axisbank.com](mailto:PNO@axisbank.com)>; Customer Service <[customer.service@axisbank.com](mailto:customer.service@axisbank.com)>; '[reportfraud@finobank.com](mailto:reportfraud@finobank.com)' <[reportfraud@finobank.com](mailto:reportfraud@finobank.com)>; '[customercare@finobank.com](mailto:customercare@finobank.com)' <[customercare@finobank.com](mailto:customercare@finobank.com)>; HEADSERVICEQUALITY/CSQG/IBANK/HYD <[headservicequality@icicibank.com](mailto:headservicequality@icicibank.com)>; YesTouch <[yestouch@yesbank.in](mailto:yestouch@yesbank.in)>; [head.grievanceredressal@yesbank.in](mailto:head.grievanceredressal@yesbank.in); Grievance-Redressal <[grievance.redressal@hdfcbank.com](mailto:grievance.redressal@hdfcbank.com)>; '[privacy@hdfcbank.com](mailto:privacy@hdfcbank.com)' <[privacy@hdfcbank.com](mailto:privacy@hdfcbank.com)>; [cybercell@iob.in](mailto:cybercell@iob.in); '[cgo@unionbankofindia.bank](mailto:cgo@unionbankofindia.bank)' <[cgo@unionbankofindia.bank](mailto:cgo@unionbankofindia.bank)>; '[contact@npci.org.in](mailto:contact@npci.org.in)' <[contact@npci.org.in](mailto:contact@npci.org.in)>; '[priyanka.agrawal@npci.org.in](mailto:priyanka.agrawal@npci.org.in)' <[priyanka.agrawal@npci.org.in](mailto:priyanka.agrawal@npci.org.in)>; '[care@jio.com](mailto:care@jio.com)'; '[Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com](mailto:Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com)' <[Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com](mailto:Hitesh.marthak@relianceada.com)>; [Kapoor.guliani@ril.com](mailto:Kapoor.guliani@ril.com); [sunil.kr.gupta@ril.com](mailto:sunil.kr.gupta@ril.com); [mahipal.singh@ril.com](mailto:mahipal.singh@ril.com); [shilpi.kant@ril.com](mailto:shilpi.kant@ril.com); [jyoti.jain@ril.com](mailto:jyoti.jain@ril.com); [amit.jain7@vodafoneidea.com](mailto:amit.jain7@vodafoneidea.com); [abhishek.jha1@vodafoneidea.com](mailto:abhishek.jha1@vodafoneidea.com); '[amit.bhatia@airtel.com](mailto:amit.bhatia@airtel.com)' <[amit.bhatia@airtel.com](mailto:amit.bhatia@airtel.com)>; [fbgoindia@support.facebook.com](mailto:fbgoindia@support.facebook.com); [secy-dot@nic.in](mailto:secy-dot@nic.in); [dirds2-dot@nic.in](mailto:dirds2-dot@nic.in); [uoidhc@gmail.com](mailto:uoidhc@gmail.com); '[abhinesh.meena@gov.in](mailto:abhinesh.meena@gov.in)' <[abhinesh.meena@gov.in](mailto:abhinesh.meena@gov.in)>; [cyberlaw@meity.gov.in](mailto:cyberlaw@meity.gov.in); [gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in](mailto:gccyberlaws@meity.gov.in); [pkumar@meity.gov.in](mailto:pkumar@meity.gov.in); [uoidhc@gmail.com](mailto:uoidhc@gmail.com)

**Cc:** Prithvi Singh <[prithvi@fiduslawchambers.com](mailto:prithvi@fiduslawchambers.com)>; Rohan Krishna Seth <[rohan@fiduslawchambers.com](mailto:rohan@fiduslawchambers.com)>; Prithvi

**Details of websites (CS COMM 332 of 2025)-**

S. No.	Domain Names	Domain Name Registrars
i.	meesho-valmo.in	GoDaddy.com, LLC (Defendant No. 2)
ii.	valmo.org.in	
iii.	valmologisticpartner.in	
iv.	valmofranchise.in	
v.	valmologisticpartners.in	
vi.	valmo-logistics.in	
vii.	valmologisticspartner.in	
viii.	valmologisticpartners.in	
ix.	valmologisticpartner.in	
x.	valmofranchise.co	
xi.	valmologisticspartners.in	
xii.	getvalmo.store	HOSTINGER operations, UAB (Defendant No. 3)
xiii.	valmodelivery.ind.in	
xiv.	valmodelivery.in	
xv.	valmodeliverys.in	
xvi.	valmologisticspartnar.in	
xvii.	valmocourier.in	
xviii.	valmologistics.ind.in	
xix.	valmologisticspartnar.in	
xx.	valmofranchise.co.in	Endurance Digital Domain Technology Private Limited (Defendant No. 4)
xxi.	valmocourierfrenchise.in	
xxii.	valmofranchise.info	PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (Defendant No. 5)
xxiii.	valmo.life	BigRock Solutions Ltd (Defendant No. 6)

**Details of the Phone numbers (CS COMM 332 of 2025):**

<b>S. No.</b>	<b>Phone Numbers</b>	<b>Telecom Service Providers</b>
i.	91-9244394126	Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited (Defendant No.15
ii.	91-6265489940	
iii.	91-6269596717	Vodafone Idea Limited (Defendant No. 16)
iv.	91-9919359675	
v.	91-9661385744	Bharti Airtel Limited (Defendant No. 17)
vi.	91-8962451086	



\$~35

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CS(COMM) 332/2025**

**FASHNEAR TECHNOLOGIES PRIVATE LIMITED .....Plaintiff**

Through: **Mr. Prithvi Singh & Mr. Rohan  
Krishna Seth, Advocates.**

**versus**

**JOHN DOE/S AND ORS .....Defendants**

Through: **Mr. Gaurav Barathi, SPC & Mr. Rahul  
Kumar Sharma, Govt. Pleader for R-  
19 & 20.**

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL**

**ORDER**

% **09.04.2025**

**I.A. 9314/2025 (exemption from filing original and clear copies of documents)**

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The plaintiff is exempted from filing original documents at this stage.
3. The application stands disposed of.

**I.A. 9312/2025 (u/s 12A of Commercial Courts Act)**

4. As the present suit contemplates urgent interim relief, in light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Krithi*, 2023 SCC Online SC 1382, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution mediation is granted.

5. The application stands disposed of.

**I.A. 9313/2025 (O-XI R-1(4) of the Commercial Courts Act)**

6. The present application has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff seeking leave to file additional documents.



7. The plaintiff is permitted to file additional documents in accordance with the provisions of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

8. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

**CS(COMM) 332/2025**

9. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

10. Issue summons.

11. Mr. Gaurav Barathi, counsel accepts summons on behalf of the defendants no. 19 and 20 and waives issuance of formal summons.

12. None appears on behalf of the defendants No. 2 to 18, despite advance service.

13. Upon filing of the process fee, issue summons to the defendants no.1 to 18, through all permissible modes, including e-mail.

14. Summons shall state that the written statement(s) be filed by the defendants within thirty days from the date of receipt of summons. Along with the written statement(s), the defendants shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the plaintiffs' documents, without which, the written statement shall not be taken on record.

15. Liberty is given to the plaintiffs to file replication(s) within thirty days from the date of receipt of the written statement(s). Further, along with the replication(s), if any, filed by the plaintiffs, an affidavit of admission/denial of documents of the defendants, be filed by the plaintiffs, without which, the replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

16. The parties shall file all original documents in support of their respective claims along with their respective pleadings. In case parties are placing reliance on a document, which is not in their power and possession,





its detail and source shall be mentioned in the list of reliance, which shall also be filed with the pleadings.

17. If any of the parties wish to seek inspection of the documents, the same shall be sought and given within the timelines.

18. List before the Joint Registrar for marking of exhibits on 21st July, 2025.

19. List before the Court 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2025.

**I.A. 9311/2025 (O-XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of CPC)**

20. The present suit has been filed seeking reliefs of permanent injunction restraining the defendant no.1 from infringing the trademark and copyright of the plaintiff, passing off their services as that of the plaintiff, along with other ancillary reliefs.

**CASE SETUP IN THE PLAINT**

21. The plaintiff is an e-commerce marketplace popularly known under its brand 'MEESHO', which commenced its operations in the year 2016.

22. As of date, the plaintiff has successfully enabled more than 15 million individual entrepreneurs to start their own online businesses. Till date, the plaintiff has delivered orders from more than 100,000 registered suppliers to over 27,000 pin codes in more than 5,000 cities and towns. The plaintiff has garnered more than Rs.500 crores in income for individual entrepreneurs and customers in more than 4,500 cities in India.

23. The plaintiff's 'MEESHO' platform is also available to its users through mobile applications, which can be downloaded from the Google Play Store and the Apple App Store. The plaintiff's 'MEESHO' app has over 50 crore downloads on the Google Play Store with a 4.5-star rating from 48.7 lakh reviews, while on the Apple App Store, it holds a 4.6-star rating from













6,400 reviews.

24. It is averred that the plaintiff is connected with the general public as well as its present and potential customers by having a prominent presence on all major social media platforms, where it promotes its business and services. These platforms have a significant number of followers of plaintiff's 'MEESHO' brand and information thereof has been provided in paragraph 14 of the plaint.

25. The plaintiff is the registered proprietor of the word 'MEESHO' and its formative marks, which are valid and subsisting. The details of registration obtained by the plaintiff in India are given in paragraph 17 of the plaint, and the same are set out below: -

S. No.	Trademark	Registration No.	Date of application/ registration	Class
1.		3719928	05 <sup>th</sup> January, 2018	35
2.	MEESHO (word)	4066599	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9
3.	MEESHO (word)	4066600	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	35
4.	MEESHO (word)	4066601	24 <sup>th</sup> January 2019	42
5.		4066602	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9



6.		4066603	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	42
7.		4066604	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9
8.		4066605	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	35
9.		4066606	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	42
10.		4066607	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9
11.		4066608	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	35
12.		4066609	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	42
13.		4066610	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9
14.		4066611	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	35
15.		4066612	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	42



16.	www.meesho.c om	4066613	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	9
17.	www.meesho.c om	4066614	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	35
18.	www.meesho.c om	4066615	24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2019	42

26. The plaintiff is also the owner and operator of the domain names ‘meesho.com’ (registered since 17<sup>th</sup> October 2015) and ‘meesho.io’ (registered since 9<sup>th</sup> May 2018). Both domains are active, with www.meesho.com facilitating the plaintiff’s e-commerce services, while www.meesho.io serves as an informational website about the plaintiff company.




27. In the year 2022, the plaintiff launched a business vertical under the trademark/ name ‘VALMO’, which is a SaaS-based facilitator of logistics services amongst sellers and logistics service providers. It is stated that the plaintiff’s innovative business model under the brand ‘VALMO’ aims to streamline the logistics process offering a smooth and efficient delivery experience, all while delivering excellent value by offering the lowest cost. It is further stated that the plaintiff’s ‘VALMO’ business helps with seamless collaboration among sellers and customers; pickup and delivery executives; first and last-mile hub operations; local and regional logistics partners; and warehouse handlers and operators.



28. The plaintiff is also the registered proprietor of the word mark



‘VALMO’, under application No. 5925960 in Classes 9, 35, 39 and 42. The said trademark stands registered in favour of the plaintiff since 6<sup>th</sup> May 2023, and is currently subsisting in the Register of Trade Marks.

29. The plaintiff is also the owner and operator of the domain ‘valmo.in’, which has been registered in the plaintiff’s favour since 14<sup>th</sup> June 2023. The said domain resolves to an active website [www.valmo.in](http://www.valmo.in) which contains information about the plaintiff’s logistics services under its ‘VALMO’ trademarks. In addition to the above registration, the plaintiff also uses the

logos  (the 'V' logo),  and  in connection with its services, which are pending registration before the Trade Marks Registry.

30. The plaintiff has further claimed that owns the copyright over the artistic rendition of its V logo , as also the logos ‘’,



31. Defendant no.1 (John Doe) along with other unknown persons are involved in duping general members of the public by misusing the plaintiff’s marks and copyright by impersonating the plaintiff’s employees and representatives. It is averred that the defendant no. 1 is operating its fraudulent activities through various rogue websites (along-with the associated email addresses), phone numbers, UPI IDs, bank accounts and social media profiles/pages/ posts on Facebook and Instagram.

32. In August 2024, the plaintiff received multiple complaints regarding



fraudulent activities associated with the website [www.valmo.org.in](http://www.valmo.org.in), wherein defendant no.1 was unlawfully utilizing the said infringing domain to approach small-scale business owners under the false pretence of being affiliated with the plaintiff's 'VALMO' business. By misrepresenting an association with the plaintiff, defendant no.1 fraudulently induced such business owners into entering a partnership, and extorting huge sums of money before ultimately deceiving them.

33. Upon being informed of the above website, the plaintiff engaged a third-party cybersecurity vendor, and through them, reached out to defendant no. 2, GoDaddy.com LCC *via* email dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2024, requesting them to immediately suspend the domain 'valmo.org.in'. Since no response was received from defendant no. 2, the cybersecurity vendor sent a reminder on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2024, reiterating the previous request and additionally seeking the suspension/blocking of email addresses associated with the said domain. Despite multiple reminders, the defendant no. 2 failed to take any remedial action.

34. As the plaintiff continued to receive fraud-related complaints concerning the website [www.valmo.org.in](http://www.valmo.org.in), it also became aware of additional infringing domains, namely [www.valmofranchise.in](http://www.valmofranchise.in), [www.valmologicpartners.in](http://www.valmologicpartners.in), and [www.valmologicpartner.in](http://www.valmologicpartner.in). Consequently, the plaintiff, through its counsel, issued a legal notice dated February 6, 2025, to the defendant no.2, highlighting the previous communications and the emergence of additional fraudulent websites operated by the defendant no.1 for phishing activities. In the said notice, the plaintiff once again called upon the defendant no. 2 to suspend/deactivate all email functionalities associated with the infringing domains and to transfer



the domain names to the plaintiff. Additionally, the plaintiff sought disclosure of the registrant information of the infringing domains. However, the defendant no. 2 did not respond to the said notice.

35. Subsequently, the plaintiff received further fraud-related complaints concerning its registered trademarks 'VALMO' and 'MEESHO', which are detailed in paragraph 27 of the plaint. Upon conducting further investigations, the plaintiff discovered additional websites/domains actively operating under the same fraudulent scheme as the previously identified infringing websites. A list of these domains is furnished under paragraph 28 of the plaint.

36. It is averred that the plaintiff also came across several profiles on the social media platforms, Facebook and Instagram, where the defendant is using the plaintiff's 'VALMO' trademarks, and is also uploading sponsored posts (advertisements), calling upon third parties to apply for the 'VALMO' franchisee through them. The plaintiff claims to have submitted several take-down requests with the defendant no.18 (Meta Platforms, Inc.) leading to take down of some of the posts and profiles/ pages of the defendant no.18. However, the defendant no.1 continued to create fresh posts and profiles/ pages.





37. A perusal of the plaint and documents would show that the defendant no.1 has been constantly infringing the trademarks and copyrights of the plaintiff with the sole motive to defraud innocent customers.

38. In view of the above, a *prima facie* case is made out on behalf of the plaintiff. Balance of convenience is in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant no.1. Irreparable injury would be caused to the plaintiff if the defendant no.1 continues to use the impugned marks and copyright. Prejudice would also be caused to the public as the defendant no.1/ John Doe is



defrauding innocent persons by claiming to provide franchisee opportunities under the plaintiff's 'VALMO' and 'MEESHO' trademarks.

39. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, the following directions are issued:

- a. Defendant no.1, its employees, servants, agents, representatives and/or others acting for and on their behalf, are restrained from infringing the plaintiff's registered 'VALMO' and 'MEESHO' trademarks and/or any other deceptively similar variant/s thereof, in any manner including domain names, websites, UPI IDs, social media handles/ names, hashtags, email addresses, bank accounts or any business papers, etc. or in any other manner;
- b. Defendant no.1, its employees, servants, agents, representatives and/or others acting for and, on their behalf, are restrained from using the plaintiff's copyright in its original artistic material in the logos V logo  as also the logos 'VALMO', , , , by reproducing, publishing the same in any manner;
- c. Defendants no.2 to 6 (the *Domain Name* Registrars) are directed to take the following steps –

- i. Suspend and lock the domain names mentioned in paragraph 22 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025,
- ii. Furnish all the available information, including but not limited to the full name, address, account details and email addresses of the





- Registrants of their respective domains mentioned in the paragraph 22 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.
- d. Defendants no.7 to 13 (*Banks*) are directed to take the following steps:-
- i. Suspend the UPI IDs and the bank accounts associated with these UPI IDs, as mentioned in the paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025;
  - ii. Freeze the bank accounts and the UPI IDs (along with the bank accounts associated with such UPI IDs) mentioned in paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.
  - iii. File under an affidavit the KYC details of the owner and/or beneficiary of the UPI IDs and bank accounts mentioned in paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.
- e. Defendant no.14 (National Payment Corporation of India) is directed to take the following steps:-
- i. Disclose all available information pertaining to the bank accounts associated with the UPI IDs mentioned in paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025;
  - ii. Suspend or block the UPI IDs mentioned in paragraph 24 of I.A. No. 9311/2025.
- f. Defendants No. 15 to 17 (*Telecom Service Providers*) are directed to take the following steps –
- i. Temporarily block the phone numbers mentioned in paragraph 26 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025;



- ii. File under an affidavit, the complete KYC documents of the registrants/ owners of the phone numbers mentioned in paragraph 26 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.
  - g. Defendant no.18 (Meta Platforms, Inc.) is directed to block/ remove/ delete all posts, Ads, profiles, and pages annexed as Document A with the plaint. Defendant no.10 is also directed to block/ remove/ delete any other post, Ad, profile and/ or page as may be notified to the said Defendant by the plaintiff (along with the supporting proof), as hosted on its social media platforms Facebook and Instagram;
  - h. Defendants no.19 (Department of Telecommunications) and 20 (Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology) are directed to issue necessary notifications/directions to all telecom and internet service providers to suspend access to all the websites as identified in paragraph 22 and phone numbers identified in paragraph 24 of the I.A. No. 9311/2025.
40. Defendants are directed to comply with the above directions within a period of 10 days.
41. Issue notice.
42. Notice is accepted by Mr. Gaurav Barathi, counsel for the defendants no. 19 and 20.
43. Issue notice to the remaining defendants by all permissible modes including e-mail.
44. Reply be filed within a period of four (4) weeks.
45. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.
46. Compliance of Order XXXIX Rule 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure,



1908 ('CPC') shall be done within a period of one (1) week from today.

47. List before Joint Registrar on 21st July, 2025 for completion of service and pleadings.

48. List before Court on 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2025.

**AMIT BANSAL, J**

**APRIL 9, 2025/at**

## **Annexure**

Subject: Action requested to be taken by MEITY and Plaintiff for effective removal of content for viewing by public at large within India as per the said orders of Hon'ble Court.

It is observed that a number of orders of Hon'ble Court are issued for blocking of websites every month. There are around more than 2700 ISPs in India and these ISPs are connected among themselves in a mesh network. DOT is instructing each of the ISPs through emails/through its website for blocking of the websites as ordered by the Hon'ble Courts. Ensuring compliance of the orders by each of the ISPs is a time-consuming and complex task especially in view of multiplicity of orders of Hon'ble Courts, multiplicity of websites to be blocked and multiplicity of ISPs.

2. Allocation of Business Rules inter-alia states thus:-

*'Policy matters relating to information technology; Electronics; and Internet (all matters other than licensing of Internet Service Provider).'*

3. In view of above and in order to ensure effective removal by content for viewing by public at large, the plaintiff is requested to do a trace route of the web server hosting the said website. In case the web server happens to be in India, the plaintiff may inform the same to Meity who may direct the owner of such web server to stop transmission of content as per IT Act and as directed by the Hon'ble Court so that the content would be blocked from the source itself and the exercise of blocking by 2700 ISPs would not be required.

4. In case such server is located abroad i.e. outside India then access to such URL/website can be blocked through the international internet gateways which are much less in number. This would result in timely and effectively removal of undesirable content for viewing by public at large as is the requirement as per the orders of Hon'ble Court.