



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2026**

STRYTEN ENERGY LLC

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Tanmaya Mehta, Mr. Krishnagopal
Abhay, Mr. Sahib Singh Dhillon, Mr.
Karmanya Singh Sareen, Ms. Shree
Sruthi, Mr. Rinku and Ms. Soumya
Banerjee, Advocates.

versus

NIDHI AGARWAL & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sudarshan Bansal and Mr. Arpit
Dudeja, Advocates for R-1 and R-2.
Ms. Kangan Roda, SPC with Ms.
Apoorva Sharma, Advocate for R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER

% **16.04.2026**

CM 94/2026 (Exemption)

1. This is an application filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as 'CPC') seeking exemption from filing dim/typed copies of Document 3 i.e., page no. 81, Document 12 i.e., page nos. 194 to 222, Document 14 i.e., page no. 238 and Document 15 i.e., page nos. 242 to 256 along with the captioned suit.
2. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions. However, dim/typed copies of the documents with proper margins be filed within four weeks with an advance copy to the respondents.
3. The application stands disposed of.

CM 95/2026 (Seeking permission to file lengthy synopsis and list of dates)

4. This is an application filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 151

W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2026

Page 1 of 3



of the CPC seeking permission to file lengthy synopsis and list of dates.

5. For the reasons stated therein, the application is allowed. However, the said synopsis and list of dates be filed within four weeks with an advance copy to the learned counsel for respondents.

6. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2026

7. This is a Civil Writ Petition filed on behalf of the petitioner under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, praying for the following:

"i) Refuse the Trade Mark Application No. 6337101 in light of the admissions of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2;

ii) Direct the Respondent No. 3 to frame guidelines on how to deal with instances of perjury and citation of fake case law/ citations in proceedings applicants, agents, attorneys and also examiners / controllers before the Trade Marks Registry;

iii) Direct the Respondent No. 3 to frame guidelines on how to deal with instances of malicious squatting of trade marks that have a well recognised global reputation before the Trade Marks Registry;

iv) Take cognizance of the grievances raised by the Petitioner against the acts of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and / or take appropriate action against the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for perjury and obstruction of justice before the Trade Marks Registry;

v) Take cognizance and / or appropriate action against the Respondent Nos. 1 on the modus operandi to register and misuse trade marks of well-established and famous brands when they have lapsed / are due to lapse, with a clear intention to illegally and mischievously ride on the goodwill and reputation of such brands;

vi) Alternative to prayer (iv) and (v), issue a writ of mandamus against the Respondent No. 3 directing them to take cognizance and / or appropriate action against the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for their respective conduct; and

vii) Pass any other order, in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondent, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the present petition."

8. Mr. Tanmaya Mehta, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner states that prayer (i) is not being pressed, however, he may be permitted to take appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Issue notice.

11. Notice is accepted by Mr. Sudarshan Bansal, learned counsel for respondent nos.1 and 2 and Ms. Kangan Roda, learned senior panel counsel for respondent no.3/Trade Marks Registry.

12. Primarily, the petitioner seeks framing of certain guidelines so as to ensure that the use/abuse or misuse of AI generated pleadings and which have resulted in, according to the petitioner, citation of false and fake cases before the Registrar are kept in check so as to ensure that such errors/abuse are nipped in the bud prior to the consideration of the application by the Registrar.

13. Ms. Roda, learned senior panel counsel for the respondent no.3 states that draft guidelines, which may be required, shall be furnished to this Court before the next date of hearing, which may be considered by this Court.

14. Mr. Mehta and Mr. Bansal, learned counsel are also requested to assist this Court in that regard.

15. Reply be filed within four weeks from date.

16. Rejoinder thereto, be filed within four weeks thereafter.

17. List before the Joint Registrar (Judl.) on 18.07.2026 for completion of pleadings.

18. List before Court on 23.09.2026 for consideration of framing guidelines.

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

APRIL 16, 2026/anj