



\$~71

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

% *Date of Decision: 11th February 2026*

+ CS(COMM) 15/2025

VERIZON TRADEMARK SERVICES LLC & ORS.....Plaintiffs
Through: Ms. Vaishali Mittal and Mr. Shivang
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

VERIZON CAREERS & ORS.Defendants
Through: None.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH**

JUDGEMENT

JYOTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

I.A. 25784/2025

1. This application is filed on behalf of the Plaintiffs under Order XIII-A Rules 3 and 6(1)(a) read with Order VIII Rule 10 and Section 151 CPC for passing a summary judgment and decreeing the suit.

2. Present suit is filed by the Plaintiffs *inter alia* seeking permanent injunction restraining Defendants No. 1 and 2 from infringing Plaintiffs' coined, earlier adopted, registered and declared well-known trademark





, and other marks similar or deceptively similar and/or comprising of trademark VERIZON and/or passing off etc.

3. By order dated 10.01.2025, Court granted *ex parte* ad interim injunction against Defendants No. 1 and 2 restraining them and all others acting on their behalf from marketing, selling, offering for sale or dealing with goods and/or services in any manner using the mark VERIZON in the domain name www.verizon-careers.com, the email address careers@verizon-careers.com and any other website, email accounts or digital assets incorporating the VERIZON mark or any other word, designation, label etc., similar thereto and other marks containing or comprising of the trademark VERIZON, leading to infringement, passing off, dilution and unfair competition. Defendant No.3 was directed to lock and suspend the domain name www.verizon-careers.com and email address careers@verizon-careers.com. Defendant No.3 was further directed to disclose to the Plaintiffs as well as by affidavit before this Court, all details of the registrant of the aforesaid domain name as well as details of the transactions undertaken while purchasing the domain name. Defendants No.4 and 5 were directed to disclose all records, communications and transactions related to the impugned activities which took place from their respective platforms, including details of individuals or entities involved in the fraudulent schemes. Defendant No.6, Google LLC was directed to disclose the originator account of the URL <https://meet.google.com/yvoezpv-mrw> as also all details associated with the account including but not limited to the mobile number associated with the account.



4. Summons were issued to the Defendants, returnable on 03.03.2025. Defendants No. 1 and 2 could not be served since Defendant No.3/DNR had locked the website. By order dated 29.04.2025, Defendants No. 3 to 6 were deleted from the array of parties on the statement of the Plaintiffs that they had complied with the directions passed by the Court and furnished all information in respect of Defendants No. 1 and 2. Thereafter, Defendants No. 1 and 2 were served with summons through e-mail on 05.05.2025 and on 10.07.2025, counsel appeared for them and stated that settlement talks were ongoing with the Plaintiffs. On 19.08.2025, none appeared for the Defendants and matter was placed before the Court. On 11.09.2025, learned Joint Registrar closed the right of Defendants No. 1 and 2 to file written statement since maximum prescribed time had expired and vide order dated 15.09.2025, the said Defendants were set *ex parte*, whereafter the present application was filed by the Plaintiffs.

5. On 15.10.2025, notice was issued in the present application to Defendants No. 1 and 2 and on 03.02.2026 noting that no reply was filed by Defendants No. 1 and 2, time to file the reply was closed. Since Defendants No. 3 to 6 were already deleted and Defendant No. 7 is a John Doe, the matter was placed before Court for further directions.

6. It is stated in the plaint by the Plaintiffs that in and around the year 2000, Plaintiffs adopted the trademark and trade name VERIZON in relation to their relations internationally. Trademark VERIZON is inherently distinctive and was coined by the Plaintiffs from the Latin word '*Veritas*', which connotes certainty and reliability and '*Horizon*', which signifies forward-looking and visionary, thereby epitomizing the genesis of Plaintiffs' company name. In 2015, Plaintiffs adopted another version of its '*check*



mark' logo **verizon**[✓] as a sign of Plaintiffs revitalized purpose of delivering the promise of a digital world i.e., simply, reliably and in a manner which consumers desire. The logo carries the essential features of Plaintiffs' first logo i.e., use of the red and black colour scheme along with red check mark symbol. With presence in over 150 countries, including India, Plaintiffs have secured the following registrations under the provisions of The Trade Marks Act, 1999 ('1999 Act'):-

Trademark	Class	Regn. No.	Date of Regn.
VERIZON	09	907928	March 06, 2000
VERIZON	35	1238068	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	36	1238069	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	37	1238070	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	38	1238071	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	42	1238067	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	41	1238072	September 18, 2003
VERIZON	16	907929	March 06, 2000
VERIZON	9, 14, 16, 28, 35, 38, 42	1405272	December 07, 2005
verizon [✓]	9, 14, 16, 18, 24, 25, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45	3068612	October 1, 2015



	16	963161	October 12, 2000
	09	963160	October 12, 2000
	41	1238077	September 18, 2003
	38	1238076	September 18, 2003
	42	1238078	September 18, 2003
	36	1238079	September 18, 2003
	37	1238080	September 18, 2003
	35	1238081	September 18, 2003
	42	1240041	September 08, 2003
	41	1240040	September 08, 2003
	38	1240039	September 08, 2003
	37	1240038	September 08, 2003
	36	1240037	September 08, 2003
	35	1240036	September 26, 2003

7. It is stated that registrations have been renewed from time to time and are valid and subsisting. It is also stated that Plaintiffs' VERIZON



trademarks and trade name have developed a stellar reputation worldwide based on the high quality of the products and services provided by them to a wide range of customers and the reputation is reflected from the revenues generated across the world as follows:-

Year	Revenues (in Billion USD)
2001	67.2
2002	67.3
2003	67.8
2004	71.3
2005	75.0
2006	88.2
2007	93.5
2008	97.4
2009	107.8
2010	106.6
2011	110.9
2012	115.8
2013	120.6
2014	127.1
2015	131.6
2016	125.9
2017	126.0
2018	130.9
2019	131.9
2020	128.3
2021	133.6
2022	136.8
2023	133.9



8. It is stated that Plaintiffs have spent billions of USD on advertisement and promotion of their products and services under VERIZON trademarks and trade names. The expenditure incurred on advertisements from 2007 to 2022 is as follows in a tabular form:-

Year	Advertisement expenses (USD Billion Worldwide)
2007	2.46
2008	2.75
2009	3.02
2010	2.45
2011	2.52
2012	2.38
2013	2.44
2014	2.52
2015	2.75
2016	2.74
2017	2.64
2018	2.68
2019	3.07
2020	3.10
2021	3.39
2022	3.56

9. It is stated that extensive promotion undertaken by the Plaintiffs in respect of their goods/services in India through Plaintiff No. 3 has resulted in significant sales adding to the business and revenues and the growing sale figures as follows are evidence of Plaintiffs' success in the commercial space under the VERIZON trademarks in India:-



Year	Revenues (in millions of INR)
2013-2014	6306.07
2014-2015	7208.98
2015-2016	5863.58
2016-2017	6611.88
2017-2018	7891.47
2018-2019	8295.65
2019-2020	8439.73
2020-2021	8732.69
2021-2022	7866.80

10. It is stated that in the last two decades, Plaintiffs have amassed unparalleled reputation and goodwill and this is substantiated by number of awards, accolades and laurels accorded to the Plaintiffs from time to time. Illustratively, some of the awards are as follows:-

Year	Name of Award	Awarding Organization
2024	#1 in customer satisfaction for Small Business Internet Service	J.D. Power
	Google names Verizon a Gold Verified Peering Provider	Google



	Verizon Business wins eight awards for world class services	Association of Briefing Program Managers (ABPM)
2023	Verizon awarded most reliable 5G network & for providing exceptional quality	RootMetrics
	Verizon India recognized under Best Firms for Women	Analytics India Magazine
2022	Verizon awarded most reliable 5G network 3X in a row; & America's best network 16X in a row	RootMetrics
	#1 in customer satisfaction with small business wireless and wireline service; & America's best network 27X in a row	J.D.Power
	Ranked 8 th most valuable brand in the world	Brand Finance Global 500
2021	2021 Fast Company's Most Innovative Companies	Fast Company
	Verizon recognized as part of 2021 Seramount 100 Best Companies	Seramount



2020	Ranked 12 th most valuable brand in the world	Brand Finance Global 500
2019	Ranked 9 th most valuable brand in the world	Brand Finance Global 500

11. Plaintiffs have taken a categorical stand in the plaint that this Court has recognized the reputation and goodwill of the Plaintiffs as also the strength of the VERIZON marks and has declared the mark as a ‘well-known’ trademark within the meaning of Section 2(1)(zg) vide judgment and decree dated 11.07.2023 passed in *Verizon Trademark Services LLC and Others v. Vikash Kumar, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 4453* and therefore, the marks have the widest amplitude of protection entitling the Plaintiffs to restrain their misuse by third parties not only for similar but also dissimilar goods.

12. It is the case of the Plaintiffs that Defendants No. 1 and 2 fraudulently represented themselves as Plaintiffs or as affiliated with them and orchestrated a fictitious recruitment process using the former corporate name of Plaintiff No. 3, Verizon India Private Limited and the logo  along with domain name www.verizon-careers.com, which was registered through services offered by Defendant No. 3. Defendants No. 1 and 2 utilized this domain to create counterfeit e-mail addresses bearing the domain @verizon-careers.com, employed logos and branding associated with the Plaintiffs and used third-party assessment platforms operated by Defendants No. 4 and 5. They also conducted interviews with prospective candidates through Defendant No. 6 followed by issuance of fraudulent offer letters and conditioned the finalization of job offer on completion of



mandatory certifications such as TensorFlow Developer Certification. Subsequently, they demanded payment of approximately Rs. 23,000/-each from the candidates for completion of the certification. On learning of these fraudulent activities, Plaintiffs were compelled to file the present suit and the Court granted *ex parte* ad interim injunction.

13. It is the case of the Plaintiffs that Defendants were indulging in organized fraudulent activities, which they executed in several steps i.e., initial contact and false job opportunity; online assessment invitation; confirmation of assessment results; conducting a fake interview; and offer of employment. A forged letter bearing Verizon's name, logo  and addresses were sent to the selected candidate. By these activities, Defendants No. 1 and 2 were receiving huge funds in their bank account and were not only cheating and duping innocent persons but were also infringing and exploiting Plaintiffs' well-known VERIZON trademarks.

14. Learned counsel for the Plaintiffs submits that Plaintiffs are prior adopters, continuous users and registered proprietors of the coined and inherently distinctive VERIZON trademarks, registered across multiple classes in India and recognized as 'well-known' by this Court. Defendants No. 1 and 2 have adopted identical mark VERIZON for identical services thus leading to confusion amongst customers and consequently infringement of Plaintiffs' marks under Sections 29(2) and 29(3) of 1999 Act. Defendants have deliberately misrepresented their fraudulent services as those of the Plaintiffs to ride upon the substantial goodwill and reputation enjoyed by the Plaintiffs since 2000, which has caused damage to Plaintiffs' reputation. All



15.09.2025. Defendants No. 1 and 2's right to file written statement was closed earlier on 11.09.2025. No steps were taken to challenge the two orders and none has appeared on behalf of Defendants No. 1 and 2 till date. This suit was instituted by the Plaintiffs seeking permanent injunction restraining Defendants No. 1 and 2 from infringing their coined and registered well-known trademark VERIZON and its logos as also from passing off, dilution, tarnishment etc. The *ex parte* ad interim injunction granted on 10.01.2025 has continued till date.

19. The plaint has been duly verified and is supported by the affidavit and Statement of Truth of Constituted Attorney of the Plaintiffs. Along with the plaint, Plaintiffs have filed a host of documents, which include trademark registrations certificates and applications; WHOIS details of Plaintiffs' domain; relevant extracts from Plaintiffs' website; print out of relevant extracts from third-party websites evidencing their goodwill, reputation as also promotion of trademark VERIZON; copy of relevant extracts from Form-10K filed by Plaintiffs in United States Securities and Exchange Commission in 2023; copies of certificates issued by Plaintiff No. 3 showcasing Plaintiffs' revenues in India; documents displaying manner of use of VERIZON trademarks by Plaintiffs as also by Defendants No. 1 and 2. Several orders passed by this Court protecting the VERIZON trademarks of the Plaintiffs from time to time have also been filed. Plaintiffs have filed on record copy of judgment dated 11.07.2023 in ***Verizon Trademark Services (supra)***, whereby this Court declared VERIZON as a 'well-known' trademark when used in the context of providing telecommunication services. Details of revenues earned and promotional expenses as also trademark registrations have been furnished in the plaint,



supported by documents.

20. Defendants No. 3 to 6 were deleted from array of parties since they complied with directions and Defendant No. 7 is a John Doe. Defendants No. 1 and 2 have failed to file written statement and hence all averments in the plaint are deemed to be admitted. Further, since no affidavit of admission/denial has been filed on behalf of the said Defendants in respect of documents filed with the plaint, the documents are also deemed to have been admitted in terms of Rule 3 of Chapter VII of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 ('2018 Rules'). In this backdrop, I am of the view that no purpose will be achieved by directing the Plaintiffs to lead *ex parte* evidence by filing an affidavit of examination-in-chief. Plaintiffs have filed on record copies of e-mails exchanged between Defendant No. 1 and the candidate who was frauded by using the name and mark of the Plaintiffs; copy of attachments shared by Defendant No. 1 in the correspondence between Defendant No. 1 and the candidate; copy of cease and desist notice issued to Defendant No. 1 by the Plaintiffs; WHOIS details of Defendant No. 1's domain and extracts from Defendant No. 1's website; and extracts from websites of Defendants No. 3, 4 and 5 reflecting the fraudulent activities of Defendants No. 1 and 2. Extracts from social media platforms have also been filed evidencing the fraudulent activities carried out by Defendant No. 1. Supporting certificate under Section 63(4)(c) of Bharatiya Sakshya Adhinyam, 2023 has been filed.

21. This Court in ***Su-Kam Power Systems Ltd. v. Kunwer Sachdev and Another, 2019 SCC OnLine Del 10764*** has observed as under:-

“90. To reiterate, the intent behind incorporating the summary judgment procedure in the Commercial Court Act, 2015 is to ensure disposal of commercial disputes in a time-bound manner. In fact, the applicability of



Order XIII A, CPC to commercial disputes, demonstrates that the trial is no longer the default procedure/norm.

91. Rule 3 of Order XIII A, CPC, as applicable to commercial disputes, empowers the Court to grant a summary judgement against the defendant where the Court considers that the defendant has no real prospects of successfully defending the claim and there is no other compelling reason why the claim should not be disposed of before recording of oral evidence. The expression “real” directs the Court to examine whether there is a “realistic” as opposed to “fanciful” prospects of success. This Court is of the view that the expression “no genuine issue requiring a trial” in Ontario Rules of Civil Procedure and “no other compelling reason.....for trial” in Commercial Courts Act can be read mutatis mutandis. Consequently, Order XIII A, CPC would be attracted if the Court, while hearing such an application, can make the necessary finding of fact, apply the law to the facts and the same is a proportionate, more expeditious and less expensive means of achieving a fair and just result.

92. Accordingly, unlike ordinary suits, Courts need not hold trial in commercial suits, even if there are disputed questions of fact as held by the Canadian Supreme Court in Robert Hryniak (supra), in the event, the Court comes to the conclusion that the defendant lacks a real prospect of successfully defending the claim.”

22. In my view, the aforesaid judgment is applicable to the present case on all four corners. This Court finds substance in the submissions of learned counsel for the Plaintiffs that Defendants No. 1 and 2 have no real prospect of successfully defending the claims in the present suit. Hence, this is a fit case where this Court can pass a summary judgment in terms of Order XIII-A CPC. Plaintiffs have established the registrations of their marks, declaration of VERIZON mark as ‘well-known’, infringing activities of Defendants No. 1 and 2 and the intent to pass off their services as that of the Plaintiffs. Defendants No. 1 and 2 were orchestrating an organized recruiting scam, using Plaintiffs’ well-known mark and logos on their correspondences, promotion campaigns etc., and cheating innocent people to part with money. Plaintiffs are right in their submission that the mark VERIZON is identical to their registered and well-known mark VERIZON



and was used for identical services, thereby amounting to infringement. Defendants No. 1 and 2, as revealed from the documents on record, which are uncontroverted, made every effort to ride upon the substantial goodwill and reputation enjoyed by the Plaintiffs since 2000 by mispresenting amongst the public. This has resulted in causing irreparable harm to Plaintiffs' reputation and customer trust. By misleading job-seekers into believing in a false nexus with the Plaintiffs, Defendants No. 1 and 2 have tarnished their image and also diluted the well-known mark VERIZON. There is no gainsaying that such unlawful activities of Defendants No. 1 and 2, whereby they have unauthorizedly, repeatedly and brazenly used identical mark VERIZON to promote their fraudulent recruitment schemes, has diluted Plaintiffs' brand value by eroding the distinctiveness of the mark, blurring its association with genuine services and tarnishing its reputation by linking it to unsafe and deceitful practices. Plaintiffs are right in stating that such injurious association undermines the uniqueness and exclusivity of Plaintiffs' brand, thereby diminishing consumer trust. Such activities also constitute unfair competition and unjust enrichment as Defendants No. 1 and 2 sought to profit by deceiving innocent members of the public and exploiting Plaintiffs' reputation, painstakingly built over decades. It will not be incorrect to observe that Defendants No. 1 and 2 utilized technology for all the wrong reasons and sent fraudulent e-mails, impersonating the Plaintiffs in electronic communications and directing innocent candidates to deceptive platforms such as TestGorilla only to extract personal data and payments under the guise of recruitment. Defendants No. 1 and 2 are, therefore, guilty of infringement, passing off, dilution and tarnishment.

23. For all the aforesaid reasons, Plaintiffs are held entitled to a decree



against Defendants No. 1 and 2 in terms of prayers 95(i), (ii) and (iii) of the plaint since learned counsel for the Plaintiffs has, on instructions, candidly given up other reliefs, save and except, costs of the proceedings.

24. Application is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

CS(COMM) 15/2025 & I.As. 505/2025, 506/2025

25. In light of the order passed in I.A. 25784/2025, the suit is decreed in terms of prayers 95(i), (ii) and (iii) of the plaint.

26. Plaintiffs are entitled to actual costs as claimed. Bill of costs is stated to have been filed by the Plaintiffs, however, the same is not on record. Let the same be placed on record and the matter be listed before the Taxing Officer on 20.03.2026 for computation of costs in terms of Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and 2018 Rules read with Delhi High Court Intellectual Property Division Rules, 2022.

27. Registry is directed to draw up the decree sheet.

28. Suit is disposed of with all pending applications.

JYOTI SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 11, 2026/YA