



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

OA Nos. 1059 and 1060 of 2025

in

C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.283 of 2025

1. Ms SNS Movies Productions LLP
No 25 MAMATHA COMPLEX
5TH FLOOR WHITES ROAD
ROYAPETTAH CHENNAI-600 014

Applicant(s)

Vs

Mr Manjunath
Sole Proprietor Of THINK STUDIO,
Having Office at
No.725, Lalabagathurshasthiri Street,
Konavattam, Vellore-632 013


Respondent(s)

PRAYER in O.A.No.1059 of 2025

To grant an order of Interim Injunction restraining the Respondent/ defendant their men, servants, agents or anyone claiming through or under in any manner Passing-Off the Applicant / Plaintiff Trade Mark and Trading Style



by using the offending Trade Mark and Trading Style



WEB COPY


or any other mark or marks which are similar or in any way deceptively similar to or a colorable imitation of the Applicants/ Plaintiffs Trade Mark, pending disposal of the presents suit.

PRAYER in O.A.No.1060 of 2025

To grant an order of Interim Injunction restraining the Respondent/ defendant their men, servants, agents or anyone claiming through or under in any manner infringing the Applicant / Plaintiff Trade Mark and Trading Style



by using the offending Trade Mark and Trading Style



or any other mark or marks which are similar or in any way deceptively similar to or a colorable imitation of the Applicants/ Plaintiffs Trade Mark, pending disposal of the presents suit.

For applicant


Mr.P.S.Raman, Senior Counsel
for Mr.Vijayan Subramanian


COMMON ORDER

The present suit has been filed for injunction against the infringement and passing-off the plaintiff's trade mark




by using the offending trade mark of the defendant






WEB COPY

2. The plaintiff claims that they have registered their trade mark and device mark under several trade mark applications. The word mark is "*think studios*". Similarly, the device mark is also registered under Classes 9, 16, 35, 38, 41 and 45. It is the further case of the plaintiff that they came to know that the defendant is using a deceptively similar trade mark



Thereupon, they have issued a cease and desist notice to the defendant on 20.12.2024 and a reply was given by the defendant on 4.1.2025 contending that they had established business in the advertising agency, influencer, marketing, digital film production, social media management, events, ad shoots, digital marketing, content creation since 2020 and they had adopted the mark



prior to the plaintiff. .


3. Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the plaintiff, by pointing out page 219 of the typed set of papers, wherein the comparison chart of the plaintiff's trade mark and that of the defendant is furnished, contends that though the defendant had replied to the cease and desist notice issued by the



plaintiff, the reply is vague without any details with regard to their establishment and registration of their trade mark.

WEB COPY

4. Since, prima facie, it is seen that the defendant's trade mark



is deceptively similar and identical to that of the plaintiff's trade mark



there will be an order of injunction, however, it would be confined to Class 41.

5. Order 39 Rule 3 CPC shall be complied with. Issue notice to defendants returnable by 18.12.2025.

12-11-2025

ssk.

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

Mr Manjunath

Sole Proprietor Of Think Studio,

Having Office At

No.725, Lalabagathurshasthiri Street,

Konavattam, Vellore-632 013



WEB COPY

5

OA No. 1059 of 2025



N.SENTHILKUMAR J.

ssk.

**OA Nos. 1059 and 1060 of 2025
in
C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.283 of 2025**

12-11-2025