

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION  
IN ITS COMMERCIAL DIVISION

COMMERCIAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION (L) NO. 15327 OF 2025

Navya Network Inc. ... Applicant /  
Petitioner

Versus

Assistant Controller of  
Patents and Designs ... Respondent

---

Mr. Manish Aryan (through VC) a/w Manisha Singh , A. Pandey, Nishant Rai, Shivani Singh, Khushi C., A. Anand and Shweta Nisar i/by Sonal Doshi & Co. for the Applicant / Petitioner.

Mr. Yashodeep Deshmukh (through VC) a/w Ashutosh Misra, Vaidehi Pradeep, and Rutwik Rao for Respondent / Patent.

---

CORAM : ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.  
DATE : 24<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY, 2026

P.C.

1. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner has completed his arguments and primary contention of learned Counsel for the Petitioner is that the impugned order does not follow the test laid down by the Delhi High Court in the case of *F. Hoffmann-La Roche Ltd. and Anr. Vs. Cipla Ltd.*<sup>1</sup>.

2. The learned Counsel invited my attention to the order and pointed out that though the impugned order records that the requirements of the inventive steps were not found, there is no reasoning in the impugned order as to why this

---

**1** (2015) SCC OnLine 13619

is so.

3. Per contra, Mr. Deshmukh, learned Counsel for the Respondent, has submitted that application was rejected, because the same did not satisfy the requirements of Section 3(k) of the Patents Act, 1970. He submits that question of inventive steps really pales into insignificance since the invention in question falls at the threshold. He, however, seeks time to place reliance upon certain judgments in support of his contention.

4. At his request, stand over to **7 March, 2026**.

[ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.]