

ITEM NO.49

COURT NO.5

SECTION XIV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No.13183/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 27-02-2026 in FA0(OS)(COMM) No. 111/2024 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

MOUNTAIN VALLEY SPRINGS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BABY FOREST AYURVEDA PRIVATE LIMITED (FORMERLY
KNOWN AS M/S LANDSMILL HEALTHCARE PRIVATE
LIMITED) & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[FOR FINAL DISPOSAL]

Date : 10-08-2026 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Amit Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Swathi Sukumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Essenese Obhan, Adv.
Mr. Neel Mason, Adv.
Mr. Dhruv Sharma, AOR
Ms. Ira S Mahajan, Adv.
Ms. Ayesha Guhathakurta, Adv.
Ms. Urvika Aggarwal, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Roshyn, Adv.
Mr. Tushar Chauhan, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Jayant Mehta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sudeep Chatterjee, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Bhatia, AOR
Ms. Tanya Arora, Adv.
Ms. Aastha Verma, Adv.
Mr. Rohan Surup, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. We heard Mr. Amit Sibal, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, and Mr. Jayant Mehta, the learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent nos. 1, 2 and 3 respectively.
2. This petition arises from the judgment and order passed by the Division Bench of the High Court of Delhi dated 27.02.2026 in FA0(OS)(COMM) No. 111/2024 by which the First Appeal preferred by the petitioner against the judgment passed by a learned Single Judge of the High Court dated 15.05.2024 came to be dismissed.
3. Mr. Sibal would submit that the respondents Trade mark "Baby Forest" is similar to the trade mark of the petitioner namely "Forest Essentials" and "Forest Essentials Baby".
4. According to him, these are identical Baby products. He would submit that the petitioner adopted its trade mark sometime in 2001, and at the time of adoption of similar marks by the respondents, the annual sales and marketing expenses were over 428 crores and 32 crore, respectively, whereas the respondents sales were around 2 crore.
5. We are further informed that the infringement suit(s)

instituted by the petitioner is liable to be stayed under Section 124 of the Trade Marks Act as the Rectification Petitions are pending before the High Court.

6. In other words, the challenge by the petitioner is to the registration of the Trade Mark of the respondents in the name "Baby Forest".

7. We are of the view that the petitioner should pursue further with these C.O.(COMM.IPDTM) Nos.186-191 of 2023 before the High Court.

8. We are informed that the Rectification Petitions are coming up for hearing on 21.08.2026.

9. We believe after hearing both the sides that it will be in the fitness of things if the High Court gives some priority and decides all the Rectification Petitions and disposed them of in accordance with law without being influenced in any manner by any of the observations made in the impugned judgment passed by the Division Bench of the Delhi High Court including the judgment of the learned Single Judge.

10. All questions of law are kept open to be agitated before the Court concerned.

11. With the aforesaid, this Special Leave Petition is disposed of.

(CHANDRESH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)