

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE OF THRISSUR**

**Present:**

**Sri. P.P. Saidalavi., Principal District Judge.**

Thursday, the 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025/13<sup>th</sup> Agrahayanam, 1947 S.E.

**IA.01/2025 in O.S. 21/2025**

**Petitioner/Plaintiff:-**

Aravindhakshan I.S., aged 74 years,  
S/o Sanku, Ithikkatt house, Vadanappilly Village and desom,  
P.O. Vadanappilly Beach, Chavakkad Taluk, Thrissur-680 614.

By Advs.K.N. Somakumar & Vishnu Hari K.

**Respondent:-**

Anugraha Marriage Bureau,  
Family Apostolate Centre, Near Bishop Palace,  
Kizhkkumpattukara, P.O. East Fort, Thrissur village  
and Taluk, Pin 680 005., Rep. by Director.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing, the court passed the following:-

**ORDER**

This is a petition under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of Code of Civil Procedure. The brief statement of facts are; The petitioner is the plaintiff in O.S.21/2025. The suit is filed under Order VII Rule 1 of CPC r/w Section 134 of the Trade Mark Act. The case of the plaintiff/petitioner is that, plaintiff/petitioner is running a marriage bureau since 1997 without any interruption at Vatanappilly and Thrissur under the name and style of

“Anugraha Marriage Bureau” which is popularly known as “Anugraha Marriage Bureau” or “Anugraha Matrimonial Services”. Over the use of the name for nearly three decades it became a symbol of trust and it earned a goodwill for the plaintiff for his area of business that is, marriage bureau. The plaintiff’s trade mark is “Anugraha” which is registered with Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Department for promotion of Industry and Internal Trade Controller General of Patents Design and Trade Mark as Journal No.1832-0 dated 15.01.2018. In spite of the plaintiff’s trade mark is a registered trade mark, the defendant have been functioning a unit attached to Bishop Palace, Thrissur and the respondent is running business under the name “Anugraha Marriage Bureau” with office at Kizhakkumpattukara in East Fort, Thrissur using very same trade mark without permission of the plaintiff/petitioner. The said act is infringement on the trade mark right of the plaintiff. It causing large attack on the goodwill and reputation gained by the plaintiff through tremendous hard work and expense. On getting the above information the plaintiff caused to issue a lawyer notice dated 27.10.2025. The defendant sent a reply agreeing to change the name of the bureau and will adopt the revised name at the earliest. But the defendant did not do so.

Hence the suit for permanent prohibitory injunction.

2. In the present petition the plaintiff prayed for an interim prohibitory injunction against the defendant and his men by restraining them from using plaintiff's trade name "Anugraha Matrimonial Services" or "Anugraha Marriage Bureau". I have heard counsel for the petitioner/plaintiff and perused the affidavit attached to the present petition and the documents produced by the plaintiff.

3. Having gone through the plaint averments, petition, documents and upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage this court satisfied that the petitioner/plaintiff made out a *prima facie* case in his favour to the effect that the defendant is using trade name similar and deceptively similar even phonetically with an intention to confuse the innocent customers and public. Therefore if a temporary injunction as prayed for is not granted the petitioner will put to irreparable loss and injury. Because if the respondent is permitted to use the trade name as similar and deceptively and phonetically similar the petitioner will put to irreparable loss and injury. Therefore balance of convenience is in favour of the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, issue an *ad-interim* ex-parte injunction as prayed for till filing the counter statement. Accordingly issue notice as well to the respondent for his appearance and comply Order 39 Rule 3 of CPC. Call on 06.01.2026.

(Dictated to the Personal Assistant, transcribed by her, corrected by me and pronounced in open court on this the 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025).

sd/-  
**P.P. SAIDALAVI.,**  
**PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE.**

By Order,

Sheristadar

/true copy/

Copied by : jg  
Compared by : pbs