



\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CONT.CAS(C) 1512/2023

KLEENOIL FILTRATION INDIA PVT. LTD. Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nancy Roy and Ms. Aastha
Kakkar, Advs.

versus

UDIT KHATRI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Pran Krishna, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

18.12.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. *Vide* order dated 29.07.2025, respondent no.1 was directed to remain present before this Court today. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that on account of ill health, the latter is unable to appear before the Court today, and has handed up his medical certificate in Court.
3. The present petition seeks non-compliance of the decree/judgment dated 09.01.2023 in CS(COMM) 72/2022, passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court, wherein issue raised by the petitioner has been decreed in terms of prayers (i) and (iii) of the plaint as under:-

“IN THE PREMISES STATED ABOVE, IT IS THEREFORE, MOST RESPECTFULLY PRAYED THAT, THIS HON'BLE COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO GRANT THE FOLLOWING RELIEFS TO THE PLAINTIFF-

A. The Defendants, their directors, group companies, principals, partners, manufacturers, sellers, retailers, wholesalers, dealers, officers, importers,



exporters, employees, agents, distributors, suppliers, affiliates, subsidiaries, franchisees, licensees, representatives, and assigns be restrained by a permanent injunction from:

i. Manufacturing or authorizing the manufacture, selling, offering for sale, marketing, exporting, importing, retailing, supplying, distributing, exhibiting, labelling, packaging, advertising, promoting, displaying, stocking, storing, dealing in and/or using, in any manner whatsoever, the counterfeit and impugned products and impugned oil filter cartridges, as depicted in Paragraph Nos. 2, 36, 50, 51, 55 and 57 of the Complaint, or any

other product bearing the marks KLEENOIL and , or any other mark or logo, which is identical or deceptively and confusingly similar to the Plaintiffs earlier trade marks KLEENOIL and

, also as mentioned under Paragraph No.4, 7 and 12 of the Complaint, either as a trade mark or part of a trade mark, or as a label or part of a label, or as a logo or part of a logo, or in any other manner whatsoever, in relation to any goods or services, or in relation to any promotional, marketing or advertising material or any other material used or intended to be used for labelling or packaging or for advertising any goods or services, thereby amounting to passing off the Defendants 'counterfeit and impugned products as that of the Plaintiffs product KLEENOIL.

iii. Manufacturing or authorizing the manufacture, selling, offering for sale, marketing, exporting, importing, retailing, supplying, distributing, exhibiting, labelling, packaging, advertising, promoting, displaying, stocking, storing, dealing in and/or using, in any manner whatsoever, the impugned products or impugned oil filter cartridges bearing impugned marks CLEANOIL and CLEANOIL Equivalent, or any other product bearing the impugned marks or any other mark or logo, which is identical or deceptively and confusingly similar to the Plaintiffs earlier trade marks

KLEENOIL and , also as mentioned under Paragraph No.2, 36, 50, 51, 55 and 57 of the Complaint, either as a trademark or part of a trade mark, or as a label or part of a label, or as a logo or part of a logo, or in any other manner whatsoever, in relation to any goods or services, or in relation to any promotional, marketing or advertising material or any other material used or intended to be used for labelling or packaging or for advertising any goods or services, thereby amounting to infringement of the Plaintiffs registered trade marks, and passing off the Defendants' impugned products as that of the Plaintiffs product



KLEENOIL.”

4. It is the case of the petitioner that despite the aforesaid decree/judgment, respondents no.1 and 2 have not complied with the same and are using infringing trademark and products.

5. Response has been filed on behalf of the said respondents and the same is on record. The said response re-agitates the issues decreed by the learned Single Judge.

6. Let compliance be done before the next date of hearing.

7. In case of non-compliance, respondents no.1 and 2 shall remain present before the Court on the next date of hearing.

8. In case of non-appearance, this Court shall consider taking coercive steps against the said respondents.

9. List on 12.03.2026.

AMIT SHARMA, J

DECEMBER 18, 2025/rr/db