

21

\$~

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

+ CS(COMM) 34/2018

SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES LIMITED ..... Plaintiff  
Through: Mr. Sachin Gupta, Advocate.

versus

M/S NOVITAS HEALTHCARE & ANR ..... Defendants  
Through: None.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN**

**ORDER**

**17.01.2018**

%

**I.A.691/2018 in CS(COMM) 34/2018**

Keeping in view the averments in the application, plaintiff is exempted from filing the originals/clearer/typed/translated copies of documents at this stage and is also permitted to file additional documents within thirty days.

Needless to say, this order is without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties.

Accordingly, present application stands disposed of.

**CS(COMM) 34/2018**

Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

Issue summons in the suit to the defendants by all modes including *dasti*, returnable for 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 before the Joint Registrar for completion of service and pleadings.

The summons to the defendants shall indicate that a written statement to the plaintiff shall be positively filed within four weeks of the receipt of the summons. Liberty is given to the plaintiff to file a replication within two weeks of the receipt of the advance copy of the written statement.

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 be also filed with the pleadings.

Admission/denial of documents shall be filed on affidavit by the parties within two weeks of the completion of the pleadings. The affidavit shall include the list of the documents of the other party. The deponent shall indicate its position with regard to the documents against the particulars of each document.

List the matter before Court on 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2018.

**I.A.692/2018 in CS(COMM) 34/2018**

Issue notice to defendants by all modes including *dasti*, returnable for 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 before the Joint Registrar.

It is pertinent to mention that the present suit has been filed for permanent injunction restraining infringement of trademark, copyright, passing-off, unfair competition, rendition of accounts of profits, damages, delivery up, etc.

In the plaint, it is stated that the plaintiff is engaged in the business of marketing drugs and formulations in more than 150 countries worldwide under its extensive range of well known and distinctive trade marks/brand names. It is stated that the plaintiff is known in the trade circles as

SUN/SUN PHARMA and has a consolidated annual turnover of over Rs. 27,992 Crores globally.

It is further stated in the plaint that the plaintiff is the no.1 Pharma Company in India in a total of 11 specialities and is the world's fourth largest generic pharmaceutical company and has manufacturing sites in six continents and 10 world class research centres with over 30,000 strong multi-cultural workforce from over 50 different nationalities.

It is stated in the plaint that the plaintiff is the registered proprietor of the coined trade mark VOLINI and the plaintiff has also obtained trade mark registrations, earliest being 19<sup>th</sup> October, 1993, for various VOLINI formative marks, which are registered for goods, namely Pharmaceutical and Medical Preparations falling in Class 5 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. It is stated that VOLINI is being sold since 1994 and is used for the treatment of pain, back pain, pain due to soft tissue injuries, musculoskeletal aches and pains, back ache, delayed onset muscle soreness and other related conditions. It is stated that the term VOLINI is an arbitrary mark and has no reference to its composition or the ailment.



It is averred that the VOLINI label including its overall and individual colour combination, get up, placement of features constitute singularly and collectively an "original artistic work" within the meaning of Section 2(c) of the Copyright Act, 1957 and is entitled to copyright protection under the provisions of Section 14 of the Copyright Act, 1957.

It is the case of the plaintiff that the annual revenue generated by the plaintiff from the sale of its products under the mark VOLINI in the financial year 2016-17 was Rs. 1691.6 Million. The plaintiff incurred an expenditure of Rs.518.3 Million on advertising and promotion of its

VOLINI products respectively.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that the defendant no.2's application for registration of the mark VOLWIN+ on a "proposed to be used basis" dated 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2010 was advertised in the trade mark journal on 04<sup>th</sup> January, 2016. He states that upon coming across the said publication the plaintiff immediately opposed the application by filing its notice of opposition on 03<sup>rd</sup> May, 2016 and to the best of the plaintiff's knowledge, the defendants have not filed any reply (counter statement). He further states that thinking that the time to file a counter statement had expired and the aforesaid application would be directed to be abandoned in due course, the plaintiff took no legal action.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that in last week of December, 2017, the plaintiff through its field force for the first time came across the defendants' medicinal products being sold under the mark VOLWIN and in a label, which is deceptively similar to the plaintiff's registered mark VOLINI and its label. He states that the defendants have unlawfully adopted the impugned mark/label for its pain relieving gel. A representation of the trade mark/label of the plaintiff and the defendants is reproduced hereinbelow:-

Plaintiff's Label	Defendants' label
 The image shows the plaintiff's label for 'VOLINI' gel. It features the brand name 'VOLINI' in a large, bold, italicized font. Above it, 'BANNAKY' and 'GEL' are written in smaller letters. To the right, there is a circular logo with the text 'Real pain Relief'.	 The image shows the defendant's label for 'VOLWIN' gel. It features the brand name 'VOLWIN' in a large, bold, italicized font. Above it, 'BANNAKY' and 'GEL' are written in smaller letters. To the right, there is a logo with the text 'Instant Relief'.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that the adoption of the impugned mark/label amounts to misrepresentation and misappropriation of the plaintiff's goodwill in its VOLINI trademarks and also amounts to unfair trade practice, unfair competition and dilution. He states that the use of the impugned trade mark and overall colour combination of the impugned label by the defendants is likely to cause confusion and/or deception in the minds of the consumers.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff lastly states that the plaintiff has been vigilantly protecting its statutory and common law rights in the VOLINI trade marks/label and has secured injunction against various parties using marks deceptively similar to the plaintiff's trade mark VOLINI.

Keeping in view the aforesaid, this Court is of the opinion that a *prima facie* case of infringement and passing off is made out in favour of the plaintiff and balance of convenience is also in its favour. Further, irreparable harm or injury would be caused to the plaintiff if an interim injunction order is not passed.

Consequently, till further orders, the defendants, their directors, partners or proprietors, as the case may be, assignees in business, its distributors, dealers, stockists, retailers, chemists, servants and agents are restrained from manufacturing, selling, offering for sale, advertising, directly or indirectly dealing in medicinal preparations under the mark VOLWIN and its label and/or any other mark/label as may be deceptively similar to the plaintiff's trade mark/label VOLINI in any manner whatsoever.

Let the provisions of Order 39 Rule 3 CPC be complied within a period of two weeks.

**I.A. 799/2018 in CS(COMM) 34/2018**

The plaintiff seeks appointment of a Local Commissioner to visit the premises of the defendant No.2. Accordingly, Ms. Priya Adlakha, Advocate, Advocate, Mobile No.7838185655 is appointed as the Local Commissioner to visit the following site of the defendant:-

**Wings Pharmaceuticals P. Ltd.  
43-44, HPSIDC, Industrial Area Baddi  
Distt. Solan 173205  
Himachal Pradesh**

The Local Commissioner shall make an inventory and take into custody all infringing goods bearing the mark VOLWIN, label/carton packaging/trade dress or any other mark/label/trade dress/carton packaging which may be deceptively similar to the plaintiff's trade mark/label/trade dress/carton packaging VOLINI along with its packaging material, promotional materials, stationary, dyes, blocks etc. However, the Local Commissioner shall return the seized infringing goods to the defendants on Superdari upon their furnishing an undertaking that it will produce the goods as and when called upon to do so by this Court.

The Local Commissioner shall break open locks and shall also be entitled to obtain police assistance from the local police stations. The SHO of the concerned police station shall render all assistance if a request in that regard is made by the Local Commissioner. The Local Commissioner shall obtain extract from the books of accounts, stock and excise registers maintained by the defendants pertaining to medicinal preparations manufactured and sold by the defendants along with pending stock of packaging material with regard to the mark VOLWIN or any VOL formative

mark which may be deceptively similar to the plaintiff's trade mark/label/trade dress/carton packaging VOLINI.

The Local Commissioner shall be entitled to take photographs as well. The fees of the Local Commissioner is tentatively fixed at Rs.1,00,000/- apart from all other out of pocket expenses.

Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

Order dasti under the signature of the Court Master.

**JANUARY 17, 2018**

js

*Manmohan*  
17/01/2018  
Court Master -  
High Court of Delhi  
New Delhi

**MANMOHAN, J**