

\$~94

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CS(COMM) 895/2025 & I.A. 20930-20935/2025**

ZEPTO PRIVATE LIMITED & ANR.

.....Plaintiffs

Through: Mr. N.K. Kantawala, Mr. Abhishek Dutta, Mr. K.Y. Siddharth Vardhman, Mr. Amaya Nair, Mr. Nishant Kanatawala, Advs.

versus

OWNER OF DOMAIN NAME ZEPTONOWINDIA.COM & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Ms. Shweta Sahu, Mr. Pradyumn Sharma and Mr. Brijesh Ujjainwal, Advs. for D-9

Mr. Varun Pathak, Adv. for D-15
Ms. Saumya Tandon, CGSC/Adv. for D-17 and 18

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% 26.08.2025

I.A. 20933/2025

1. This application under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ['CPC'] has been filed by the Plaintiffs seeking exemption from filing fair and typed copies of the dim documents, which have been filed with the suit.
2. Subject to the Plaintiffs filing fair typed, clear and legible copies of the dim documents within four (4) weeks from today, exemption is granted for the present.

3. Accordingly, the captioned application stands disposed of.

I.A. 20935/2025

4. This is an application under Section 149 CPC read with Section 151 CPC, filed by the Plaintiffs seeking extension of time in depositing court fees.

5. Learned counsel for the Plaintiffs states that the court fees certificate has already been filed with the registry.

6. In view thereof, the relief sought in the application has become infructuous.

7. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

I.A. 20934/2025

8. This is an application filed by the Plaintiffs under Section 80 of CPC seeking exemption from serving the two (2) months' notice on Defendant Nos. 17 and 18.

9. Issue notice.

10. Ms. Soumya Tandon, Advocate who is present in Court has accepted the notice on behalf of Defendant Nos. 17 and 18.

11. For the reasons stated in the application, and considering the fact that the said Defendants have been impleaded to secure compliance of the directions, the same is allowed.

I.A. 20931/2025

12. The present application has been filed by the Plaintiffs seeking exemption from instituting pre-litigation mediation under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 ['Act of 2015'] read with Section 151 of the CPC.

13. Having regard to the facts of the present suit contemplates urgent

interim relief and in light of the of the Supreme Court in **Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Keerthi**¹, exemption from the requirement of pre-institution mediation is granted to the Plaintiffs.

14. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

I.A. 20932/2025

15. This is an application seeking leave to file additional documents under Order XI Rule 1(4) of CPC [as amended by the Act of 2015] read with Section 151 CPC, within 30 days.

16. The Plaintiffs, if they wish to file additional documents will file the same within 30 days from today, and they shall do so strictly as per the provisions of the Commercial Courts Act and the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 [‘DHC Rules’].

17. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed.

18. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

CS(COMM) 895/2025

19. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.

20. Summons be issued to Defendant Nos. 1 to 8 and Defendant Nos. 10 to 12 by all permissible modes on filing of process fee. Affidavit of service(s) be filed within two (2) weeks.

21. The summons shall indicate that the written statement(s) must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of the summons. The Defendants shall also file an affidavit(s) of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiffs, failing which the written statement(s) shall not be taken on record.

22. The Plaintiffs are at liberty to file replication(s) thereto within thirty

¹ (2024) 5 SCC 15.

(30) days after filing of the written statement(s). The replication(s) shall be accompanied by an affidavit(s) of admission/denial in respect of the documents filed by the Defendants, failing which the replication(s) shall not be taken on record.

23. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.

24. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

25. Ms. Shweta Sahu, learned counsel for Defendant No. 9 accepts summons and waives the formal service of summons.

26. Since Defendant Nos. 13 to 18 have been impleaded in the present proceedings to comply with the interim directions passed by this Court, issuance of summons to the said Defendants is deferred at this stage.

27. Defendant No. 19 is an unknown entity. The Plaintiffs are granted liberty to sue the said Defendant as Ashok Kumar. However, no summons are being issued to the said entity at this stage.

28. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) for completion of service and pleadings on **09.10.2025**.

29. List before the Court on **18.02.2026**.

I.A. 20930/2025

30. The present application under Order XXXIX, Rules 1 and 2 of the CPC, has been filed by the Plaintiffs, seeking an interim injunction against the Defendants.


31. The case set up by the Plaintiffs in the plaint, may be summarised as under: -

30.1. Plaintiff No. 1 - Zepto Private limited is engaged in providing a wide

range of services including warehousing, logistics, last-mile delivery, marketing and advertising solutions, wholesale trading of consumer goods (B2B), and the manufacturing of private label brands.

30.2. Plaintiff No. 2 is a wholly owned subsidiary of Plaintiff No. 1. Plaintiff No. 2's Platform [Zepto website and mobile application], enables transactions between buyers and sellers of various consumer goods and has garnered widespread recognition across India on account of its robust technological infrastructure and efficient quick delivery system.

30.3. In 2021, Plaintiff No. 1, adopted, and commenced use of the zepto trademarks and trade name zepto/Zepto in relation to its quick-commerce business involving the instant delivery of groceries and essential items across various cities in India.

30.4. Plaintiff No. 1 as the sole proprietor of the zepto trademarks -  /zepto/Zepto has secured statutory trademark registrations in respect of various 'zepto/Zepto' per se as well as formative trademarks in India. The details of the same are provided at paragraph 8.4 of the plaint.

30.5. Plaintiff No. 1 vide Licence Agreement dated 20.05.2025, has authorised Plaintiff No. 2 to use the zepto trademarks and all variations thereof in relation to the platform, thereby vesting in Plaintiff No. 2 unrestricted right to commercially exploit the zepto trademarks in connection with its services.

30.6. The Domain names 'zeptonow.com' and 'zepto.com', which is Plaintiff No. 2's official website, were registered on 10.05.2021 and 24.06.2024, respectively.

30.7. The 'zepto' mobile application has witnessed extensive downloads,

solidifying the Plaintiffs position as industry leader in the quick commerce space. With millions of downloads across Google Play Store and the iOS App Store, the zepto mobile application has become a household name.

30.8. Plaintiff No. 2 also operates various social media pages dedicated to its zepto trademarks and brand on popular social media platforms, the details of which are provided in paragraph no. 9.5 of the plaint.

30.9. In the year 2024-25, Plaintiff No. 1 earned a revenue of Rs. 11,593 Crores and incurred expenses of Rs. 1,180 Crores towards its advertisement and promotional activities. The detailed revenue figures of Plaintiff No. 1's product and the details of expenses incurred by Plaintiff No.1 in relation to the zepto trademarks are set out at paragraph nos. 9.8 and 9.9 respectively.

30.10. There are several sub-brands operated by Plaintiff No.1 that use the zepto trademarks as a common source identifier. The detailed list of all collaborations is given in paragraph 9.19 of the plaint.

32. It is averred that a widespread and coordinated fraudulent scheme is being carried out by Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 and unknown entities/Defendant No. 19 by misusing Plaintiff No. 1's registered zepto trademarks, brand name, and goodwill to mislead members of the public into paying substantial sums under the guise of securing a zepto franchise or job opportunities with the Plaintiffs and its subsidiaries.

31.1. Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 are operating or are connected with various infringing domain names/websites, which were registered through the services offered by Defendants Nos. 8 to 12.

31.2. It is stated that on 09.01.2025, 14.05.2025, 28.06.2025, 30.07.2025, and 31.07.2025, the Plaintiffs received several email(s) from general public and sits prospective customers, seeking to verify the authenticity and

legitimacy of several fraudulent domain names containing Zepto trademarks. It is stated that a few emails included contact details of the persons, who falsely represented themselves as relationship managers associated with the Plaintiffs and demanded payments to different bank accounts [the details of which were also provided in the said email(s)]. The details of the said fraudulent domain names, contents of the email(s) are provided in paragraph nos. 13.1, 13.4, 13.5, 13.7, and 13.9 of the plaint.

31.3. On basis of an internal investigation, Plaintiff No.1 confirmed that aforesaid email address, contact persons and bank accounts had no affiliation with the Plaintiffs and subsequently, Plaintiff No. 1 issued a public notice via a LinkedIn post, warning the public about the circulation of such fake communications, advising them not to engage with unauthorized parties, and urging members of the public to verify such details before making any payment or sharing personal information.

31.4. It is stated that in the first week of May 2025, the Plaintiff No. 1 came across two [2] unauthorized and fraudulent websites, namely <https://zeptojob.com> and <https://www.zeptojobs.in>, which were falsely projecting themselves as official platforms of the Plaintiffs for the purpose of inviting applications for delivery partner roles under the zepto trademarks. The said websites were traced and were found to be operated by Defendant Nos. 2 and 3 [or entities under their control].


31.5. On 08.05.2025, Plaintiff No. 1 filed a police complaint detailing the impersonation, misuse of the zepto trademark, and the broader fraudulent scheme being orchestrated by the operators of these Fake Recruitment Website.

31.6. Plaintiffs have also identified social media pages and social media

groups operating on Facebook, Instagram and LinkedIn, which continue to unlawfully reproduce and exploit the Zepto trademarks, the details of which are provided at paragraph no. 14.2 of the plaint. The Defendant No. 7 has created, hosted, and promoted several deceptive social media accounts purporting to represent the Plaintiffs; the details of the which are provided at paragraph no. 14.1 of the plaint.


33. Mr. N.K. Kantawala, learned counsel for the Plaintiffs submits that the malafide conduct of the Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 is clearly reflected in their calculated and systematic misuse of the zepto trademarks, trade dress, branding, and reputation to project a false association with the Plaintiffs and to mislead the general public. He states that in view of the aforesaid facts and circumstance, this Court be pleased to grant an ex-parte ad-interim injunction against Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 as well as unknown entities/Defendant No. 19 and in favour of the Plaintiffs.

34. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the Plaintiffs and perused the record.

35. It is a matter of record that Plaintiff No. 1 is the registered proprietor of the device mark , as well as wordmarks 'zepto' and 'Zepto' [hereinafter collectively referred to as 'Plaintiff's trademarks'/'Zepto trademarks'].

36. Upon a perusal of the documents placed on record and averments made in the plaint, this Court is of the prima facie opinion that Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 as well unknown entities/Defendant No. 19 by illegally using the Plaintiff's trademarks on their websites/social media pages are trying to create an impression that their websites and social media pages, are

connected and associated with the Plaintiffs and/or its officials.

37. The usage of the mark Zepto and logo  by Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 as well unknown entities/Defendant No. 19 on their fake website, fake social media pages prima facie appears to be identically similar to the Plaintiff's registered trademarks.

38. The Plaintiffs have placed on record the fabricated communications [forged letters, misleading email correspondences, fake job postings] and documents showing unauthorised use of names and pictures of the Plaintiff's management as well as Plaintiff's registered trademarks intended to mislead the general public. The said documents substantiate the plea of fraud alleged in the plaint.

39. In view of the aforesaid it is further evident that if Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 as well as unknown entities/Defendant No. 19 are not restrained from infringing Plaintiff's registered trademark, the said Defendants will continue to engage in fraudulent activities to deceive and entice members of the general public into parting with money under the false promises of jobs, training and partnership.

40. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is of the prima facie opinion that that Plaintiffs have established a case of grant of ex-parte ad-interim injunction in their favour and against Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 as well as unknown persons/Defendant No. 19. The balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiffs and irreparable loss would be caused to the Plaintiffs, if the ex-parte ad-interim injunction is not granted at this stage.

41. Accordingly, till the next date of hearing, the following directions are issued: -

- 40.1. Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 and Defendant No. 19, their directors, officers, partners, proprietors, agents, employees, and all others acting for or on their behalf, are hereby restrained from using the zepto trademarks, tradename or any other mark identical or deceptively similar to Plaintiff No. 1's trademarks in connection with fraudulent recruitment, impersonation, phishing, or offering goods and services in any manner leading to infringement of the Plaintiff No.1's trademarks or passing off their services as that of the Plaintiffs, including but not limited to the use of the name zepto in email addresses, domain names, job offers, or websites or promotional material.
- 40.2. Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 and Defendant No. 19 are directed to immediately suspend/block/take down and transfer all infringing domain names, and email addresses incorporating the zepto brand name or any deceptively similar variant thereof-including but not limited to the domain names/websites enlisted in paragraph no. 13.9 of the plaint.
- 40.3. Defendant Nos. 8 to 12 [who are the Domain Name Registrars ('DNRs') of Defendant Nos. 1 to 7] are directed to immediately block and suspend the domain names enlisted in paragraph 13.9 of the plaint and any redirect thereof.
- 40.4. Defendant Nos. 13 and 14 [Banks mentioned in the Memo of Parties are directed to freeze the Bank accounts, mentioned at paragraph no. 13.9 of the plaint within 36 hours.
- In addition, Defendant Nos. 13 and 14 to disclose complete KYC documents as well as bank statement of owner/beneficiaries of the

bank accounts within three (3) weeks.

- 40.5. The Defendant No. 15 [Meta Platforms Inc.] is directed to take down/delete/remove social media accounts, and deceptive posts, as listed in paragraph no. 14.1 [Serial Nos. 1 and 2] and 14.2 [Serial Nos. 1 to 3] of the plaint.
- 40.6. The Defendant No. 16 [LinkedIn] is directed to take down/delete/remove social media accounts, and deceptive posts, as listed in paragraph no. 14.1 [Serial No. 3] of the plaint.
- 40.7. In case, Plaintiffs become aware of any other social media accounts/URLs, which are similarly infringing the trademarks of the Plaintiffs, they will be at liberty to approach Defendant Nos. 15 and 16, who will act upon the said request promptly. In case, the Defendant Nos. 15 and 16 has any doubt about the request made it shall communicate the same to the Plaintiffs within 24 hours, so that the Plaintiffs can approach this Court.
- 40.8. The Defendant No. 17 i.e., Department of Telecommunication [‘DoT’] is directed to issue necessary directions to the telecom service providers [‘TSPs’] to block/suspend the mobile numbers mentioned at paragraph no. 13.09 of the plaint and direct the TSPs to disclose complete KYC documents and details of the subscribers of the said mobile numbers
- 40.9. The Defendant No. 18 i.e., Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology [‘MeitY’] is directed to issue necessary notifications/directions to internet service providers [‘ISPs’] to block/delete/suspend the access to the impugned domain names, mentioned at paragraph 13.09 of the plaint.

40.10. Defendant Nos. 13 to 18 will comply with the aforesaid direction of take down and suspension within 36 hours of the receipt of order.

40.11. Defendant Nos. 15 and 16 will provide Basic Subscriber Information pertaining to the infringing accounts/URLs along with IP logs to the Plaintiff within three (3) weeks. Defendant Nos. 8 to 12 will disclose KYC and payment details as well as IP addresses, of the registrants of Defendant Nos. 1 and 7.

42. Plaintiffs are also given liberty to implead any other domain/website, if discovered, by filing an application under Order I Rule 10 CPC, along with an affidavit with sufficient supporting evidence for seeking extension of the injunction to such websites; based on which the learned Joint Registrar (J) may extend the order passed today, in respect of the new website(s) or so discovered.

43. If any website, which is not primarily an infringing website, is blocked in pursuance of the present order, the said website is permitted to approach this Court by giving an undertaking that it does not intend to infringe the Plaintiff's trademarks and thereafter, the Court would consider modifying the injunction accordingly.

44. Similarly, with respect to social media accounts, telephone numbers, bank accounts etc., which are discovered during the pendency of the suit, the Plaintiffs shall be at liberty to approach this Court for seeking appropriate directions in this regard.

45. The provisions of Order XXXIX Rule 3 CPC shall be complied within one (1) week from today.

46. Issue Notice.
47. Ms. Shweta Sahu, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant No. 9 accepts notice and waives formal service of notice.
48. Mr. Varun Pathak, learned counsel accepts notice for the Defendant No. 15 and waives formal service of notice.
49. Ms. Soumya Tandon, learned counsel on behalf of Defendant Nos. 17 and 18 accepts notice and waives formal service of notice.
50. Let the notice be issued to the remaining Defendant Nos. 1 to 8 and Defendant Nos. 10 to 14 and 16 by all permissible modes on filing of process fee. Affidavit of service(s) be filed within two (2) weeks.
51. It is clarified that since Defendant Nos. 13 to 18 have been impleaded for seeking compliance of the interim order, the said Defendants are exempted to file a reply to this application. However, the said Defendants are directed to inform this Court about the compliance of the interim order by way of filing affidavits within three (3) weeks.
52. Since, Defendant No. 19 is an unknown entity, issuance of notice to the said Defendant is deferred at this stage.
53. Let the reply to this application be filed by Defendant Nos. 1 to 7 within a period of three (3) weeks.
54. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of three (3) weeks thereafter.
55. List before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on **09.10.2025**.
56. List before the Court on **18.02.2026**.
57. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No

physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

AUGUST 26, 2025/hp/MG