



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-06-2026

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

OA Nos. 237 & 238 of 2026

& A.Nos.1387, 1655 & 1656 of 2026

in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.88 of 2025

O.A.Nos.237 & 238 of 2026


1. Reliance Industries Limited
Jio Studios, No.89, A1 Tower, 5th floor
Dr.Radha Krishnan Salai, Mylapore,
Chennai – 600 004 represented by its
Constituted Attorney Ms.Dipti Kishan Kotak
2. B62 Studios Private Limited
Unit No.611, Reliables Pride, Anand Nagar,
Opposite Heera Panna, Jogeshwari West,
Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400 102, India
represented by its Constituted Attorney
Ms.Shweta Vora

..Applicant(s)

Vs

- 1.Amazon Seller Services Private Limited
Buildings Alyssa, 8th Floor,
Brigade Gateway, 26/1,
Dr.Rajkumar Road,
Bangalore, Karnataka 560055 & 13 others

..Respondent(s)



WEB COPY



For Applicant(s):

Mr.Arun C Mohan

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Sathish Parasaran (Senior Counsel)
For Ms.Akshaya Ramadurai (For RR4 & R7)

Mr.Rahul Balaji (For R1)

Mr.Thriyambak J.Kannan (For R11)

Mr.G.Ajay Raj (For R3)

Ms.Tanushree Arvind (For R5)

COMMON ORDER

By order dated 18.03.2026, an injunction had been granted on a prima facie finding that there has been an unauthorised sale of merchandise, which amounted to infringement of the rights of the applicant. Thereafter, by order dated 29.04.2026, recording the statement of the learned counsel appearing for the defendants 10 and 11 that, pursuant to the order of injunction, an offending links had been taken down, this Court had also permitted the plaintiffs to call upon the intermediary concerned to take down the mirror websites set up to contravene the order of interim injunction.

2. Mr.Sathish Parasaran, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the defendants 4 and 7 would submit that the Schedule-A URLs given in the plaint have now become inaccessible at the instance of the users themselves. Therefore, there is no purpose in taking them down.



3. He would further submit that the address of the said defendants have also been wrongly given, for which, a memo had also been filed by them.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the plaintiff is directed to take necessary steps to amend the plaint accordingly. Further, in view of the statements made by the learned counsel appearing for the defendants 4, 7, 10 and 11, who are the intermediators as per the Information Technology Act, the plaintiff is permitted to notify the defendants 4, 7, 10 and 11 as and when the similar infringement, which had been indicated by this Court in its order dated 18.03.2026, is being publicised on their platforms. On such information being received and if the same relates to the injunction in the present suit, the said defendants are directed to take it down. They are also at liberty to refuse such requests, if it does not relate to the *lis* in the present suit.

5. The other defendants, on whose platforms the infringing products are being sold, are directed to file an affidavit of compliance.

6. List the matter after four weeks.

22-06-2026
(2/2)

kak



WEB COPY



K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

kak

**OA Nos. 237 & 238 of 2026
& A.Nos.1387, 1655 & 1656 of 2026
in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.88 of 2025
(2/2)**

22-06-2026