

**Intellectual Property**  
**Newsletter**

# The IP Odyssey

**MARCH 2026**

**Authored by:**  
**Purvi Mehta (Associate)**  
**Prankush Sharma (Intern)**  
**Yashasvi Tiwari (Intern)**

# TRADEMARK TAPESTRY

## DELHI HC RESTRAINS SPA DE SOLEIL FROM USING DERMATOUCH SKINCARE MARK

The Delhi High Court granted an ex-parte ad-interim injunction to Cloud Wellness Pvt Ltd, restraining US-based Spa De Soleil Inc from using the "DERMATOUCH" trademark or any deceptively similar mark for cosmetic and skincare products. Justice Tushar Rao Gedela held that Cloud Wellness established prior adoption and registration since April 1, 2017, with substantial goodwill evidenced by ₹95 crore turnover and "Most Trusted Brand" awards. The Court found the identical marks, despite minor case differences, likely to confuse unwary consumers via common channels like [ibhejo.com](http://ibhejo.com) and [thedermatouch.com](http://thedermatouch.com), tilting the balance of convenience in plaintiff's favor amid irreparable harm risks. Spa De Soleil was directed to remove all references from online platforms.

Source-[Read More](#)

## DELHI HC RESTORES INJUNCTION PROTECTING STELLADEXIN COOKER TRADEMARK

The Delhi High Court set aside a single judge's order and restored an ex-parte ad-interim injunction granted in August 2024, restraining Nilkamal Ltd and others from selling infringing "STELLA" commercial induction cookers. A Division Bench of Justices C. Hari Shankar and Om Prakash Shukla held that Section 30(3) of the Trade Marks Act does not apply, as Products and Ideas India Pvt Ltd is the sole Indian registered proprietor of "STELLADEXIN", and respondents imported without consent. Rejecting defenses of international exhaustion and prior user, the Court clarified that "registered trademark" under Section 2(w) refers only to Indian registrations, not foreign ones held by SIC. The matter was remanded for fresh consideration of interim applications on April 2, 2026.

Source-[Read More](#)

## DELHI HC ORDERS STATUS QUO ON DR REDDY'S 'OLYMPIC' IN OZEMPIC SUIT

The Delhi High Court directed status quo on the sale and distribution of Dr Reddy's Laboratories' semaglutide injection branded "Olympic", amid Novo Nordisk's trademark infringement suit alleging deceptive similarity to its blockbuster diabetes drug "Ozempic". Justice Jyoti Singh found prima facie phonetic, visual, and structural resemblance between the marks, applying stricter confusion standards for pharmaceuticals due to risks of dispensing errors via handwritten/telephonic prescriptions. Noting both drugs share active ingredient semaglutide and trade channels, the Court remarked physicians and consumers are not immune from confusion, especially without side-by-side comparison. Dr Reddy's sought time for instructions; no further promotion/sale permitted pending March 28, 2026 listing.

Source-[Read More](#)

## DELHI HC REJECTS BRITANNIA INJUNCTION AGAINST RENEWTRIA MARK

The Delhi High Court refused interim injunction to Britannia Industries against Madhve Global Enterprises' use of "RENEWTRIA" inside a similar pentagonal geometric label, holding the five-sided device alone lacks distinctiveness without the "BRITANNIA" wordmark. Justice Manmeet Pritam Singh Arora, in the March 24, 2026 order (CS(COMM) 480/2024), found no visual, structural similarity when comparing rival composite marks as a whole, with differing wordmarks, colours, and schemes unlikely to confuse consumers. The Court criticized Britannia's for not specifying infringing registered marks, prejudicing the defendant and hindering claim appreciation. Dismissing the application, it noted deliberate vagueness, distinct goods (candies vs. bakery), and no irreparable harm, favoring balance of convenience for the defendant.

Source-[Read More](#)

## BOMBAY HC CANCELS TRACTORJUNCTION MARK FOR BAD FAITH ADOPTION

The Bombay High Court allowed Rajat Kumar's petition under Section 57 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, directing cancellation of Shivankar Gupta's "TRACTORJUNCTION" registration in Class 35 (business services), holding it was obtained in bad faith through a fraudulent user affidavit despite no evidence of actual use or prior rights. Justice Arif S. Doctor noted Kumar's prior adoption in 2014 and continuous use since 2016, uncontroverted due to Gupta's non-appearance, with Gupta's unsupported 2011 claims via Shreeji Motors lacking assignment proof. An investigation confirmed non-use, rendering the registration violative of Sections 11(10) and 18, warranting expungement.

Source-[Read More](#)

## MADRAS HC ORDERS REMOVAL OF SUGAR POP COSMETICS MARK

The Madras High Court directed removal of the "SUGAR POP" device trademark from the register on Sugar Brands Pvt Ltd's rectification petition, finding it entered without sufficient cause due to the Registrar's failure to exercise due diligence in searching for conflicting marks. Justice Senthilkumar Ramamoorthy noted Sugar Brands' prior use of "SUGAR" marks since February 1, 2015, for cosmetics like soaps and perfumes- identical goods to Sugar Pop Bath and Body LLP's registration with the word "SUGAR" as the dominant, deceptive element likely causing confusion. The Court held the Registrar's February 20, 2019 search report incorrectly showed no conflicts despite Sugar Brands' prior registrations, warranting rectification under Section 57(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999; removal to occur within four weeks, no costs ordered.

Source-[Read More](#)

# TRADEMARK TAPESTRY

## KARNATAKA HC UPHOLDS INJUNCTION AGAINST TULSI AGARBATTI MARK

The Karnataka High Court upheld a trial court injunction restraining Jallan Enterprises from using the "TULSI" mark for agarbattis, finding it prima facie deceptively similar to Sarathi International's longstanding "TULASI" trademark due to phonetic identity from mere omission of the letter "a". Justice Ravi V. Hosmani rejected Jallan's descriptive use defense under Sections 30 and 35 of the Trade Marks Act, noting the prominent, larger-font display of "TULSI" alongside Tulsi imagery functioned as a source identifier rather than mere fragrance descriptor, unlike terms like camphor or lavender.

The Court affirmed the trial court's discretion, emphasizing balance of convenience favouring the prior user to avoid brand dilution and consumer confusion.

Source- [Read More](#)

## BOMBAY HIGH COURT DENIES INTERIM RELIEF IN DISPUTE OVER "UTS" TRADEMARK AND DOMAIN NAME

In *Universal Test Solutions LLP and Another v. Punam Kumari Singh and Others*, the Bombay High Court considered an application for interim injunction concerning alleged trademark infringement, copyright piracy, and passing-off. The plaintiffs (Universal Test Solutions LLP) sought to restrain the defendants from using marks such as "Universal Technology Solutions" and "ODC Universal Technology Solutions," as well as the domain name "www.uts-global.com". The dispute originated from a 2012 partnership between the parties that later dissolved, leading to conflicting claims over the ownership of the "UTS" brand and associated software.

The Court's analysis focused on the priority of use and the specific statutory requirements for infringement by a corporate name. Regarding the domain name, the Court found that Defendant No. 2 had registered "uts-global.com" in 2010- two years before the plaintiffs' partnership was even formed. The Court rejected the plaintiffs' claim of ownership, noting a lack of evidence that the domain was ever formally transferred to the LLP or that registration costs were reimbursed. On the issue of the defendants' corporate name, the Court applied a strict interpretation of Section 29(5) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999. It held that for a corporate name to infringe a registered trademark, it must use the *exact* mark; since "Universal Technological Solutions" was not identical to the registered "Universal Test Solutions," the "deceptive similarity" test used in other trademark disputes did not apply.

Accordingly, the Court declined to grant an interim injunction regarding the domain name and the corporate name "ODC Universal Technological Solutions (P) Ltd.". However, it recorded and accepted an undertaking from the defendants that they would not use several other specific marks- including "Test Magic" and "RoboMagic" which they had already discontinued. The Court also noted that the plaintiffs failed to provide a detailed comparison of source codes to prima facie establish copyright infringement.

The judgment clarifies the narrow scope of Section 29(5) of the Trade Marks Act, emphasizing that trademark protection against a business name requires a higher degree of identity than a standard trademark-to-trademark comparison. It also reinforces that in digital disputes, the "prior user" defense is potent when a defendant can prove registration and maintenance of a domain name preceding the plaintiff's entry into the market.

Source- [Read More](#)

## DELHI HIGH COURT AFFIRMS TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT IN CROCODILE LOGO DISPUTE

In *Crocodile International Pte. Ltd. v. LA Chemise Lacoste and Another*, the Delhi High Court adjudicated a long-standing international conflict over the use of the iconic crocodile emblem in the Indian market. The plaintiffs (Lacoste), a renowned French apparel brand, accused the defendants (Crocodile International) of trademark infringement and passing off for using a standalone crocodile device mark that they alleged was deceptively similar to their own registered logo. While both parties had shared history and various co-existence agreements in other Asian territories, the dispute in India centered on whether those agreements permitted the defendants to use a standalone saurian (crocodile) mark without their accompanying "CROCODILE" word mark.

The Court's analysis hinged on the interpretation of two key instruments: a 1983 agreement and a 1985 letter. The defendants argued that these documents established a global spirit of co-existence that extended to India, effectively granting them permissive use of the marks listed in the 1983 agreement's Schedule which they claimed included the impugned standalone mark. Lacoste countered that the 1985 communication was merely a unilateral letter of consent and did not constitute a binding contract that authorized the use of an unregistered, deceptively similar standalone logo in the Indian jurisdiction.

Upon review, the Division Bench upheld the findings of the Single Judge, determining that the use of the standalone crocodile device by the defendants indeed amounted to trademark infringement. The Court noted that the defendants' primary trademark registrations in India featured the crocodile logo alongside the word "CROCODILE," and using the device in isolation created a significant likelihood of consumer confusion with Lacoste's well-known mark. The Court found that the 1983 and 1985 arrangements did not provide a blanket authorization for such use in India, especially when it deviated from the specific logos the defendants were registered to use.

Accordingly, the Court maintained the partial decree in favor of Lacoste, confirming the injunction against the defendants' use of the standalone mark. However, both parties filed cross-appeals: the defendants sought to set aside the infringement ruling and costs, while Lacoste appealed against the denial of reliefs related to copyright infringement and passing off.

The judgment underscores that international co-existence agreements must be strictly construed according to their territorial and literal scope. It emphasizes that a "letter of consent" for trademark registration does not necessarily translate into a broad license for "permissive use" of deceptively similar variations of a mark, particularly when such use risks diluting the distinctiveness of a globally recognized brand like Lacoste.

Source- [Read More](#)

# COPYRIGHT CORNER

## DELHI HC ASKS ACHARYA BALKRISHNA TO NARROW DOWN HIS PERSONALITY RIGHTS CLAIM

The Delhi High Court declined to pass a blanket takedown order in Acharya Balkrishna's personality rights suit and instead asked him to narrow down the grievances to specific URLs and content. Justice Tushar Rao Gedela observed that public figures must tolerate criticism, satire, and commentary, and the Court cannot order removal of content from unidentified parties on the basis of omnibus allegations alone.

The Bench also questioned attempts to include news reports by established publications and noted that removal requests should be limited to allegedly offending material, not judicial reporting or broad categories of speech. The matter was adjourned to allow Balkrishna to file a more precise list of allegedly infringing content.

Source- [Read More](#)

## GAUTAM GAMBHIR WITHDRAWS INTERIM RELIEF PLEA IN PERSONALITY RIGHTS SUIT

Former Indian cricketer Gautam Gambhir withdrew his application for interim injunction before the Delhi High Court, which criticized the lack of specific defendant-wise and URL-wise takedown prayers identifying allegedly infringing content. Justice Jyoti Singh noted that without a proper table listing defendants and URLs, no effective order could be passed, as broad prayers were unworkable for intermediaries like Meta and Google.

The Court granted liberty to file a fresh application with complete particulars, observing that vague pleadings made compliance technically difficult. Gambhir seeks ₹2.5 crore damages for misuse of his name, image, likeness, and misinformation campaigns.

Source- [Read More](#)

## DELHI HC QUESTIONS COPYRIGHT IN AI-GENERATED SONG

The Delhi High Court raised doubts on whether copyright can be claimed over an AI-generated song in a suit filed by songwriter Tarun Chaudhary alleging infringement of a track whose master rights he purchased. Justice Tushar Rao Gedela noted the unsettled legal position on AI works, observing no precedent exists, and impleaded the Registrar of Copyrights for clarification under Section 2(d)(vi) of the Copyright Act, 1957.

The plaintiff claims human-written lyrics and Suno AI-generated music via specific prompts qualify as computer-generated authorship, but defendants argue the platform's terms do not guarantee copyright in outputs. The Court refused interim injunction due to unclear pleadings on ownership (lyrics, composition, or recording), granting time for replies.

Source- [Read More](#)

## DELHI HC GRANTS DYNAMIC INJUNCTION AGAINST TATA IPL 2026 PIRACY

The Delhi High Court granted JioStar India Private Limited an ex-parte ad-interim dynamic injunction restraining rogue websites from unauthorized streaming of TATA IPL 2026 matches, recognizing its exclusive digital broadcast rights acquired from BCCI for 2023-2027. Justice Tushar Rao Gedela found a prima facie case of infringement by sites like daddylikes.nl, noting irreparable harm from live event piracy that prevents effective monetization.

The order directs domain registrars to suspend infringing domains and disclose registrant details, ISPs to block URLs, and allows real-time notification to DoT/MEITY for new sites, including mirrors/proxies. Summons issued.

Source- [Read More](#)

## KAITHI PRODUCERS SUE BHOLAA MAKERS OVER REMAKE RIGHTS AT BOMBAY HC

Chennai-based Dream Warrior Pictures filed a copyright suit at the Bombay High Court seeking permanent injunction against Reliance Entertainment Studios, Ajay Devgn FFilms LLP, and others from exploiting the 2023 Hindi remake Bholaa of its 2019 Tamil hit Kaithi, claiming remake rights reverted after termination of agreements due to non-payment of ₹4 crore plus interest.

The Bombay High Court has rejected the plea by the makers of Bholaa that the copyright dispute concerning the Hindi remake of Kaithi should be heard exclusively in Chennai. The Court held that it does have jurisdiction to hear the suit filed by Dream Warrior Pictures against the film's producers, including Ajay Devgn's production house and Reliance Entertainment. The dispute centres on alleged breach of copyright and remake agreements, including non-payment of dues under the 2023 agreements, with the plaintiffs also seeking to restrain the film's further exploitation. The matter is set to proceed before the Bombay High Court, reinforcing Mumbai as the appropriate forum for adjudication.

Source- [Read More](#)

## SUPREME COURT QUASHES COPYRIGHT CASE AGAINST SUJOY GHOSH OVER KAHAAANI 2

The Supreme Court quashed criminal proceedings against director Sujoy Ghosh in a copyright infringement case alleging his 2016 film Kahaani 2: Durga Rani Singh copied Umesh Mehta's script "Sabak". Justices P.S. Narasimha and Alok Aradhe found the complaint contained only bald allegations without prima facie similarity between works, and Ghosh's screenplay registration in 2012-2013 predated Mehta's 2015 script, precluding infringement.

The Court criticized the CJM's mechanical summoning order lacking application of mind and SWA expert panel's rejection of similarity claims, holding proceedings frivolous and vexatious. The Jharkhand High Court's refusal to quash was set aside, ending the case filed under Sections 63, 65, 65A Copyright Act, 1957 and Section 387 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

Source- [Read More](#)

# COPYRIGHT CORNER

## **BOMBAY HIGH COURT GRANTS INTERIM RELIEF IN QUIA TIMET ACTION TO PREVENT COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT**

In *Phonographic Performance Limited v. Absolute Legends Sports Private Limited and Others*, the Bombay High Court addressed an urgent application seeking to restrain the unauthorized public performance of copyrighted sound recordings during cricket matches. The plaintiff, Phonographic Performance Limited (PPL), established that it holds exclusive rights to grant licenses for a vast repertoire of sound recordings. The dispute arose when the respondents, organizers of "Legends League Cricket," failed to obtain the necessary licenses for their 2026 match fixtures despite a history of doing so.

The Court's analysis focused on the respondents' past conduct and the imminent threat of copyright infringement. It was noted that the respondents had previously procured licenses from PPL and had even provided an undertaking on December 23, 2023, acknowledging PPL's exclusive rights. This undertaking explicitly stated that licenses would be obtained whenever PPL's recordings were communicated to the public at events controlled by the respondents. The Court categorized the suit as a *quia timet* action, finding PPL's apprehension of infringement to be well-founded given that the 2026 match fixtures showed events scheduled almost daily without any license being in place.

Accordingly, the Court granted ad-interim relief, restraining the respondents from publicly performing PPL's copyrighted sound recordings or allowing their premises to be used for such purposes without a valid license. The Court emphasized that despite a legal notice being issued, the respondents had not responded, and their continued conduct necessitated an injunction to protect the plaintiff's rights before the actual infringement occurred during the ongoing tournament.

The judgment underscores the importance of *quia timet* actions in intellectual property law to prevent certain and imminent injury. It reaffirms that where a defendant has a history of acknowledging a plaintiff's rights through prior licenses and undertakings, any attempt to proceed without such authorization warrants immediate judicial intervention to maintain the status quo and protect the owner's exclusive copyright.

Source- [Read More](#)

## **DELHI HIGH COURT DECLINES INTERIM INJUNCTION AGAINST NEWSLAUNDRY IN TV TODAY NETWORK DISPUTE**

In *TV Today Network Limited v. News Laundry Media Private Limited and Others*, the Delhi High Court addressed a significant conflict between copyright protection and the right to critique media through satire and parody. The plaintiff, TV Today Network (operator of channels like Aaj Tak and India Today), accused the digital news platform NewsLaundry of copyright infringement, commercial disparagement, and defamation. The plaintiff alleged that NewsLaundry's programs reproduced its original broadcasts without permission and used derogatory remarks to tarnish the reputation of its anchors and the network.

The Court's analysis centered on the "fair dealing" doctrine under the Copyright Act and the balance between protecting intellectual property and safeguarding free speech. NewsLaundry contended that its use of the plaintiff's content was "transformative," serving the dominant purpose of providing media criticism, review, and satire, which is protected under law. They further argued that their subscription-based business model did not compete with the plaintiff's advertisement-driven revenue, thus negating claims of "stealing" viewership or commercial injury. Regarding defamation, the defendants raised the "defence of truth" and argued that harsh criticism in the context of public interest does not automatically equate to legal defamation.

Upholding the Single Judge's decision, the Division Bench declined to grant an interim injunction against the defendants. The Court emphasized the limited scope of appellate interference in discretionary interim orders and noted that a prima facie case alone does not suffice for an injunction if the "balance of convenience" favors the defendant and no "irreparable injury" is demonstrated. It held that complex issues such as malice, the qualitative necessity of using copyrighted extracts, and the veracity of defamatory claims are matters of evidence that can only be conclusively determined through a full trial.

The judgment underscores that in intellectual property and defamation disputes involving media houses, courts must exercise caution before muzzling speech through prohibitory injunctions at the interlocutory stage. It reinforces the principle that legitimate criticism and satirical journalism occupy a protected space, provided they are not proven to be malicious or purely intended for commercial usurpation.

Source- [Read More](#)

## **DELHI HC SETS ASIDE REFUSAL OF HARVARD'S INSULIN CELL PATENT**

The Delhi High Court set aside the Patent Office's August 25, 2022 order refusing Harvard College's patent application for stem-cell-derived insulin-producing pancreatic  $\beta$  cells (SC- $\beta$  cells) intended for diabetes treatment. Justice Tejas Karia held that the Controller erred by failing to independently examine amended claims filed post-hearing, which shifted focus from a broad composition to specific non-native cells, materially altering the invention's scope.

The Court noted the refusal relied primarily on original claims, ignoring amendments that could change patentability analysis under Sections 3(e), 3(j), 10(4), and 10(5), without reasoned engagement. Remanding for fresh consideration within six months with hearing opportunity, it clarified no merits adjudication, emphasizing procedural fairness.

Source-[Read More](#)

## **DELHI HC SETS ASIDE PATENT REFUSAL FOR VIOLATING NATURAL JUSTICE**

The Delhi High Court quashed the Patent Office's refusal order against Wirtgen GmbH's application for a bit holder and base part for milling machines, ruling that introducing new technical objections like claim scope under Section 10(4)(c) of the Patents Act, 1970 for the first time in the final order violated natural justice principles. Justice Manmeet Pritam Singh Arora held that applicants must get a fair opportunity to address all grounds via prior examination reports or hearing notices, as per audi alteram partem.

The Court also faulted the inventive step rejection under Section 2(1)(ja) of the Patents Act, 1970 for lacking reasoned analysis under the five-step test, failing to explain why a skilled person would combine prior arts D1-D4 to arrive at the claimed structure. The matter was remanded for de novo consideration within four months, with fresh notice listing all objections.

Source - [Read More](#)

## **KARNATAKA HC ALLOWS WACOM EVIDENCE COLLECTION FOR US PATENT SUIT**

The Karnataka High Court permitted Japanese firm Wacom Co Ltd to gather documents and testimony from Bengaluru-based Cirel Systems Pvt Ltd via local commissioner for use in its US patent infringement suit against Shenzhen Qianfenyi Intelligent Technology Co Ltd over stylus products. Justice P Sree Sudha held India's Article 23 Hague Evidence Convention declaration does not bar requests for specifically identified evidence, rejecting Cirel's pre-trial discovery objection.

Wacom sought no relief against non-party Cirel but critical integrated circuit data for proving infringement; the Court ordered in-camera proceedings, confidentiality club, and sealed evidence transmission to the US District Court (Eastern District of Texas). Decided March 1, 2026 (Civil Petition 426/2025).

Source-[Read More](#)

## **CALCUTTA HC HOLDS GUI REGISTRABLE AS DESIGN**

The Calcutta High Court ruled that graphical user interfaces (GUIs) like screen icons and layouts displayed on electronic devices qualify for protection as "designs" under the Designs Act, 2000, if they meet Sections 2(a) and 2(d) criteria, rejecting the Controller's blanket rejections.

Justice Ravi Krishan Kapur set aside orders denying registration to applicants including NEC Corporation and TVS Motor, holding GUIs "applied" to display screens via industrial processes, visible during normal use, and judged by the eye despite functionality—provided aesthetic elements are not solely functional.

The Court flagged Designs Office's inconsistent stance on Locarno Classification and urged legislative clarificatory guidelines, distinguishing GUI visuals from unprotected computer programs or purely functional aspects.

Source-[Read More](#)

## **CJEU HOLDS FIRST AI COPYRIGHT HEARING IN LIKE v GOOGLE CASE**

On March 10, 2026, the Court of Justice of the European Union held its first oral hearing on generative AI and copyright in Like Company v Google Ireland Ltd (C-250/25), referred by a Hungarian court over Gemini chatbot outputs allegedly reproducing press content without permission.

The four questions address whether LLM training constitutes reproduction, if TDM exceptions apply, communication to the public via probabilistic outputs, and attribution to AI providers; parties debated technical processes, opt-out mechanisms, and extraterritorial EU law application.

Member States split on unitary process theory for training abroad but EU deployment, with Advocate General opinion due September 3, 2026, potentially reshaping AI training obligations.

Source - [Read More](#)

## **FEDERAL CIRCUIT FINDS GENE THERAPY HOST CELLS PATENT-ELIGIBLE**

The US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit reversed a district court's summary judgment ruling that REGENXBIO's patent claims for genetically engineered host cells containing recombinant nucleic acids from different organisms were patent-ineligible under §101. Chief Judge Moore held the claims directed to "markedly different" characteristics from naturally occurring cells, akin to Chakrabarty's engineered bacterium.

Distinguishing Funk Brothers and Myriad, the court emphasized the human-made splicing creates new molecules incapable of forming in nature, with significant utility for gene therapy, satisfying Alice step one. The claims' ordered combination further confirmed eligibility at step two, remanding for further proceedings.

Source - [Read More](#)



**ANM ThinkPod**

# FIRM HIGHLIGHTS



**ANM GLOBAL**  
Advocates & Legal Consultants

**NEW CITY, NEW MILESTONE:  
ANM GLOBAL IN HYDERABAD**

Sonali Mishra - Partner  
(Media & Entertainment)

We are delighted to welcome Ms. Sonali Mishra as a Partner in our Media & Entertainment Practice at ANM Global's Hyderabad office.

New office. New Partner.

ANM Global continues its growth in Hyderabad with Ms. Sonali Mishra joining the Media & Entertainment Practice as Partner.

ANM Global advised Applause Entertainment on its Master Agreement with StoryTV App (By Eloelo group), a leading microdrama platform in India, marking an exclusive collaboration to create a curated slate of premium microdramas and push the boundaries of short-form storytelling.



**Applause Entertainment & Story TV**  
to pioneer a new microdrama  
revolution in India

# FIRM HIGHLIGHTS



ANM Global is pleased to have represented Tumbaga Media Private Limited (Studio9), successfully advising in relation to all production and exploitation related agreements in relation to the audio-visual content.

ANM Global is pleased to have represented RKD Studios (RK Duggal Studios Private Limited), successfully advising for the acquisition and exploitation of dubbing rights of the film in Hindi and other global languages (excluding South Indian languages).



# FIRM HIGHLIGHTS



ANM Global is pleased to have represented Turtle Adverts (AK Enterprises), providing legal support in drafting, negotiating, and executing agreements with the film's producers for in-film brand integrations.

ANM Global is proud to have successfully represented Applause Entertainment Private Limited, providing comprehensive legal advisory for the Film as well as end-to-end legal support towards drafting, reviewing and negotiation of all production related agreements and exploitation agreement.



ANM Global is proud to have successfully represented Pocket Aces Pictures Private Limited (Clout), providing legal advisory towards negotiating and executing the agreements for influencer Mr. Ravish Shetty for his participation in the reality show.

## DISCLAIMER

The information provided in this newsletter is for general informational purposes only and should not be considered professional advice. We will not be liable for any harm incurred by you as a result of placing reliance on such information. Through this newsletter, you may be able to link to other websites and content that are not under our control. The inclusion of any links does not necessarily imply a recommendation or endorse the views expressed within them. Before making any decisions based on the information provided in this newsletter, we recommend consulting with a qualified professional for advice tailored to your specific situation.

## OFFICES

### MUMBAI

1. Office No.7, 2nd floor, Nagin Mahal, Plot No. 82, Veer Nariman Road, Churchgate  
Mumbai - 400020
2. 411/413, Dilkap Chambers, Off. Veera Desai Road, Fun Republic Lane, Andheri West, Mumbai -  
400053  
Ph: 022-4971 1084

### NEW DELHI

Awfis L29 - L34, 1st Floor,  
Connaught Place  
New Delhi, 110001  
Ph: 011-4054 1860

### BENGALURU

21/2, 1st Main Road, Opp Indian  
Overseas Bank, Gandhinagar,  
Bengaluru - 560009  
Ph: 080-2350 9909

### HYDERABAD

Elite Work Hub, Level 1,  
MB Towers, Road No. 10,  
Avenue 4, Banjara Hills,  
Hyderabad,  
Telangana - 500034



[contact@anmglobal.net](mailto:contact@anmglobal.net)



[ANM Global](#)



[+91 22 2287 3499](tel:+912222873499); [+91 22 4971 1084](tel:+912249711084)

RECOMMENDED FIRM FOR MEDIA AND ENTERTAINMENT BY **ASIALAW PROFILES**

