



\$~1 (OS)

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 193/2019**

COLGATE PALMOLIVE COMPANY & ANR.Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Prajjwal Kushwaha. Advocate (M:
7791065506).

versus

NIXI & ANR.Defendants

Through: Mr. Saurabh Seth, Standing Counsel
for NIXI (M: 7042363448).
Mr. Mrinal Ojha, Mr. Debarshi Dutta,
Mr. Arjun Mookerjee, Mr. Shivam
Tiwari, Mr. Nikhil Gupta, Mr. Yogesh
Singh and Mr. Aditya Dash,
Advocates for D-3 (M: 7007453108).
Mr. Varun Pathak, Mr. Vishbsh
Sharma and Mr. Tanus Sharma,
Advocates.

2(OS)

+ **CS(COMM) 700/2019**
XIAOMI TECHNOLOGY INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED
& ANR.Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. Peeyoosh Kalra, Advocate with
Mr. Ritwik Sharma, Advocate (M:
9971260523).

versus

WWW.XIAOMI-INDIA.XYZ & ORS.Defendants

Through: Ms. Anindita Mitra, Advocate for Go
daddy (M: 7838533122).
Mr. Nishant Gautam CGSC with Ms.
Kavya Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi and
Mr. Vibhav V. Nath Advs. for MeITY
(M: 8755614619).

3 (OS)

+ **CS(COMM) 12/2022**



NEW BALANCE ATHLETICS INCPlaintiff
Through: Mr. Urfee Roomi and Mr. Ayush
Dixit, Advocates (M: 7011629381).
versus
NBSTORESININDIA.IN & ORS.Defendants
Through: Mr. Rakesh Kumar SPC with Mr.
Sunil, Adv. for UOI (M: 9811549455).
Mr. Amit Tiwari, CGSC with Mr.
Chaitanya Puri, Advocate (M:
9354181841).

4 (OS)
+

CS(COMM) 389/2022
THE CAPITAL GROUP COMPANIES, INCPlaintiff
Through:
versus

ASHOK KUMAR & ORS.Defendants
Through: Ms. Anindita Mitra, Advocate for Go
daddy (M: 7838533122).
Ms. Nidhi Ramam CGSC with Mr.
Nikunj, Adv. for R-4 and 5.
Mr. Nishant Gautam CGSC with Ms.
Kavya Shukla, Mr. Vineet Negi and
Mr. Vibhav V. Nath Advs. for MeITY
(M: 8755614619).

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

ORDER
% **29.04.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. In these matters, there are several steps that have to be taken by the Government as directed *vide* judgement dated 24th December, 2025. For the same of completeness, the operative directions issued to the Government as contained in paragraph 283(B) of **CS(COMM) 193/2019** are extracted hereunder:



“(B) Directions to the Government

(xv) The following directions are issued to MeitY, MHA and other relevant Government authorities:

(a) The Government shall hold a stake holder consultation with all DNRs and Registry Operators offering services in India and explore the possibility of putting in place a framework similar to the one used by NIXI by all DNRs for the purpose of domain name registration.

(b) Consider nomination of a nodal agency such as NIXI as the data repository agency for India with which all the Registry Operators and the DNRs would maintain details related to Registrants on a periodic basis so that the said details are made available to the Courts, LEAs and the governmental authorities for the purpose of enforcement of orders of Courts and for preventing misuse. Alternatively, DNRs shall be directed to localize the data in India for easy access. Irrespective of the decision, it is made clear that processing of personal information would be strictly in terms of the DPDP Act and applicable Rules.

(c) In case of a DNR or Registry Operator, which does not comply with the orders of the Courts or with request from LEAs, the offering of services of such DNRs or Registry Operator be blocked by MeitY and DoT under Section 69A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 read with Information Technology (Procedure and Safeguard for Blocking for Access of Information by Public) Rules, 2009.

(d) MeitY along with NIXI shall coordinate with ICANN to enable brand owners in India to avail of TMCH facilities on reasonable terms and conditions so that they can receive notifications whenever any conflicting /infringing domain names are proposed to be registered by any third parties across the globe.

(xvi) The CGPDTM could also consider publishing the



list of well-known marks along with the official and authentic website details of the trademark owners so that if any consumer or user wishes to verify the authentic website, the same would be made possible through the website of the Intellectual Property Office. The same shall also act as sufficient notice to all potential Registrants as to the actual websites of the well-known marks/brands.”

3. Today, Mr. Nishant Gautam, Id. CGSC has placed before the Court some instructions which he has received from the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (hereinafter “MeitY”) which shows that stakeholder consultation is presently underway. One of the stakeholders is the Internet Corporation on Assigned Names and Numbers (hereinafter “ICANN”), from which some responses have been received.
4. Let MeitY put up a proper status report in these matters giving details of all the stakeholders with whom consultation has been held, the minutes of meeting all the meetings held and what further directions would be required to give effect to the mechanism as contemplated in the judgment dated 24th December, 2025 passed in these matters.
5. Let a competent official from MeitY, who is familiar with these matters, remain present to assist the Court on the next date.
6. List on 13th July, 2026.

PRATHIBA M. SINGH, J.

APRIL 29, 2026/MR/MSH