International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope (IRJMS), 2025; 6(4):186-195

Original Article | ISSN (O): 2582-631X DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2025.v06i04.07633

An Analysis of the Limitations of the Trademarks Law in India: Challenges and Perspectives

Sukhcharan Singh Chahal*, KB Asthana

Maharishi Law School, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Lucknow, UP, India. *Corresponding Author's Email: lookforsukh75@gmail.com

Abstract

The Trade Marks Act, 1999, constitutes the principal legislative framework for the registration, protection, and enforcement of trademarks in India, and aligns with international agreements such as the TRIPS Agreement. Despite its comprehensive nature, the Act's efficacy is constrained by enduring structural and operational challenges, including protracted adjudication due to docket congestion following the transfer of IP appeals to High Courts, inconsistent recognition of well-known marks, and insufficient accommodation of digital-era issues such as domain-name misuse and online counterfeiting. This article critically examines these limitations across substantive (registrability, distinctiveness, dilution), institutional (adjudication delays, administrative backlog), and procedural (opposition, enforcement) dimensions. It further explores the treatment of dilution, non-traditional marks, and parallel imports in practice, alongside a review of key Indian case law on confusion, passing off and punitive damages. This article identifies gaps, such as low awareness among SMEs and artisans, a lack of clear evidentiary standards for the likelihood of confusion, and the absence of a dedicated mechanism for cybersquatting disputes. Drawing on statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and comparative perspectives—including the Madrid Protocol, TRIPS, and EU/US approaches—targeted reforms are proposed: codified and transparent criteria for well-known mark determination, expedited procedures for IP disputes, explicit and TRIPS-consistent rules for domain names and dilution, and sustained capacity building for small enterprises. Strengthening statutory provisions and institutional capacity would enhance the timeliness of remedies, reduce legal uncertainty, and better equip Indian trademark law to address the realities of a digital and global marketplace.

Keywords: Cybersquatting, Dilution, Enforcement, India, Trade Marks Act 1999, Well-Known Trademarks.

Introduction

This study primarily addresses institutional and procedural constraints—including adjudication delays, opposition workflows, and enforcement practices—while also engaging with related substantive concerns such as registrability, distinctiveness, and dilution. The paper contributes by synthesizing Indian doctrine with TRIPS, Madrid, and EU/US comparators to clarify evidentiary and procedural expectations; foregrounding understudied issues—digital infringement, domain-name abuse, and non-traditional marks; and proposing practice-ready, incremental reforms for courts and the Registry. Trademarks are essential components of both international and national economies, as they provide businesses with the legal means to protect their products and services. In India, the Trademark Act of 1999 is the cornerstone legislation for the registration, protection, and enforcement of trademarks. This Act is harmonized with international treaties, particularly the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) (1), and is intended to safeguard businesses from unfair competition and trademark violations. Despite its comprehensive legal framework, the Act encounters several limitations and challenges that obstruct its full implementation, thereby weakening the efficacy of trademark protection in the nation. This study primarily explores institutional and procedural barriers, with a specific focus on enforcement delays, opposition, and appeals, while also examining related substantive issues such as distinctiveness, registrability, and dilution, and their influence on outcomes. The study's contributions are twofold: it introduces a structured framework that classifies constraints into institutional, procedural, and substantive categories; and it provides a synthesis of Indian legal principles with comparative insight

(Received 01st July 2025; Accepted 26th September 2025; Published 20th October 2025)

to foster incremental, practice-oriented reforms. Trademarks play a pivotal role in the dissemination of market information and the cultivation of goodwill by ensuring reliable identification of sources and reducing search costs. In India, the Trade Marks Act of 1999 establishes a comprehensive statutory framework that governs the processes of registration, delineates the scope of rights, and outlines available remedies. The principles of distinctiveness, absolute and relative grounds for refusal, opposition, infringement, and passing off are well-entrenched within this framework. Nonetheless, inconsistencies in procedural timelines and variations in evidentiary practices pose challenges to ex-ante deterrence and contribute to increased litigation expenses.

A prominent challenge associated with the Trademark Act is the extended duration of litigation processes. In India, trademark disputes often take several years to resolve due to a significant backlog in the judiciary and the lack of specialized intellectual property tribunals. Despite the introduction of the Business Courts Act of 2015, which aimed to accelerate the resolution of commercial disputes, including those related to trademarks, the pace of legal proceedings remains sluggish. The case of Time Incorporated v. Srivastava exemplifies the issue of prolonged legal battles. In this instance, Time Inc. pursued legal action against Srivastava for infringing on its renowned trademark, "Time," but the drawn-out judicial process resulted in a delay of justice for several years. Although Time Inc. eventually succeeded and received damages, the protracted nature of the litigation underscores the inefficiencies present in the current system (2).

A notable challenge in trademark law is the safeguarding of well-known trademarks. While the Trademark Act acknowledges the existence of well-known trademarks and extends certain protections, the journey to achieve such recognition is often prolonged. The landmark case of ITC Limited v. Philip Morris Products SA serves as an example, where Philip Morris was accused of infringing upon ITC's well-known trademark, "Wills," by using the designation "Marlboro Wills." Although ITC ultimately succeeded in its legal pursuit, the case illuminated the complexities involved in obtaining recognition and protection for well-known trademarks. The court is required to consider multiple factors, such as public recognition and the duration of trademark use, to determine the well-known status of a trademark, which can present challenges for businesses (3).

A significant issue inadequately addressed by the Trademark Act is cybersquatting. This practice involves the registration of domain names that closely mimic established trademarks, with the intent to sell them for profit or deceive consumers. An early example of cybersquatting is the case of Yahoo Inc. v. Akash Arora, where the defendant registered the domain name "yahooindia.com" to create brand confusion with Yahoo. The Delhi High Court ruled in favor of Yahoo, affirming that domain names fall under the same legal principles as trademarks. However, the absence of explicit prohibitions against cybersquatting in the Act complicates litigation in these cases, particularly as Internet commerce continues to expand (4).

Beyond the legal obstacles, there is a notable gap in public awareness regarding trademark rights, especially among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and local artists. A significant number of businesses do not fully appreciate the advantages of trademark registration, which leads to the underutilization of the protections offered by the Act. This gap in understanding is particularly pronounced in rural regions and industries where traditional knowledge and geographical indications (GIs) are prevalent, resulting in many important marks remaining unregistered and at risk of being misused (5).

Methodology

The Trademark Act of 1999 serves as the cornerstone of trademark protection legislation in India, governing the processes of trademark registration, protection, and enforcement. This Act, which replaced the earlier Trademark Act of 1958, aligns with international standards, particularly those outlined in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Its primary aims are to secure the rights of trademark holders, prevent the misuse of trademarks, and promote fair competition. Despite its comprehensive nature, it is essential for businesses and individuals to thoroughly understand its key provisions and relevant case law to protect their intellectual property rights effectively (6).

Legal Method and Sources

This study employs a doctrinal analysis of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, examining significant Indian judicial decisions on deceptive similarity, passing off, dilution, and well-known marks, as well as administrative materials from the Trade Marks Registry. Comparative references to the TRIPS Agreement, the Madrid System, and EU/US dilution jurisprudence are included to assess India's approach to dilution. Empirical data are drawn from publicly available statistics from the CGPDTM and WIPO to illustrate trends in trademark filing, examination, and registration.

The Act defines a trademark as a mark that can be graphically represented and serves to distinguish the goods or services of one entity from those of another. This expansive definition encompasses names, symbols, logos, colors, shapes, and even sounds, thereby permitting the registration of a diverse array of marks. In the legal case of ICICI Bank Ltd. v. APS Star Industries Ltd, the court underscored the significance of distinctiveness in a trademark, determining that ICICI's trademark was distinctive and warranted protection against unauthorized use (7).

The registration process commences with the submission of an application to the Registrar of Trademarks, which must include the applicant's name, a graphical representation of the mark, and a description of the goods or services offered. Once the application is reviewed and satisfies the necessary criteria, it is published in the Trademark Journal to allow for any public opposition. If no opposition is raised, the trademark is registered, conferring exclusive rights to its owner.

The Act delineates the grounds for refusing registration, which include both absolute and relative grounds. Absolute grounds pertain to marks that lack distinctiveness, are descriptive of the goods or services, or are customary in the trade. Relative grounds involve conflicts with an already registered mark or the potential for confusion with an existing trademark registration. Furthermore, the Act provides special protection for well-known trademarks in India. In the case of Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri, the court granted relief to Tata Sons, affirming that their "Tata" mark was well-known and thus merited extensive protection against infringement, even for unrelated goods and services (8).

A registered trademark is valid for a decade from its registration date and can be renewed in subsequent ten-year periods. If a trademark is not renewed, it may be removed from the register, although it can be restored under certain conditions. Trademark infringement occurs when an unauthorized party uses a mark that is identical or similar to a registered trademark in a way that is likely to cause confusion among the public. Legal remedies for such infringement include injunctions, damages, and accounts of profits. The tort of "passing off" offers protection for unregistered trademarks. This occurs when one party falsely represents its goods or services as those of another, thereby harming the original trademark owner's goodwill. The case of Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd. is a significant ruling on passing off, where the Supreme Court outlined factors such as the nature of goods and the class of buyers in evaluating the potential for confusion between similar-sounding names. The Act allows for the assignment and licensing of trademarks, enabling the owner to transfer ownership or grant permission to another party to use the trademark under specified conditions. To ensure legal enforceability, both assignments and licenses must be registered with the Trademark Registry.

The Act grants heightened protection to well-known trademarks. These trademarks, due to their significant reputation and broad public recognition, are shielded from unauthorized use, even when applied to goods or services that are not directly related to those for which they are registered. This legal principle was affirmed in the case of Daimler Benz Aktiegesellschaft v. Hybo Hindustan, where the court ruled that the prestigious "Benz" trademark could not be used by another company for unrelated products, thereby illustrating the concept of trademark dilution (9).

The Act explicitly forbids the registration of trademarks that may mislead or create confusion, including those deemed offensive or in violation of public order or moral standards. Additionally, it excludes geographical names, government insignia, and certain other symbols from registration eligibility. The Act establishes procedures for the rectification or removal of trademarks from the register. Parties who feel wronged may seek rectification on grounds such as non-use, erroneous registration, or breaches of the Act's provisions. A registered trademark that remains unused for a continuous period of five years may face removal. This principle was illustrated in the case of Hardie Trading Ltd. v. Addisons Paint and Chemicals Ltd., where the trademark's non-use led to its removal, highlighting the necessity of maintaining active use of a registered trademark. Following the publication of a trademark in the Trademark Journal, any individual has a four-month window to oppose its registration. These opposition proceedings serve as a mechanism to contest potentially infringing marks prior to their official registration (10).

The Act includes penalties for offenses such as trademark infringement, trademark falsification, and the false representation of a registered trademark. Penalties range from imprisonment to fines, depending on the severity of the offense. The Delhi High Court’s ruling in Time Incorporated v. In Lokesh Srivastava, both punitive and compensatory damages were awarded for trademark infringement, marking a step forward in the enforcement of intellectual property rights (2).

The Act addresses the concept of exhaustion of rights, stipulating that a trademark owner's rights are deemed "exhausted" once the goods have been introduced to the market. This provision permits parallel imports, allowing genuine goods to be imported and sold in India without the trademark owner's consent, provided that they were lawfully acquired in the foreign market. The Act also established the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) to adjudicate appeals against decisions made by the Registrar of Trademarks. However, the IPAB was abolished in 2021, with its functions transferred to the High Courts under the Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021 (11, 12).

The Trademark Act of 1999 establishes a comprehensive legal framework for the registration, protection, and enforcement of trademarks in India. Landmark cases such as Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satya Deo Gupta, Cadila Health Care Ltd. v. Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd., and Time Incorporated v. The Lokesh Srivastava case significantly influenced the interpretation and application of the Act. Despite its robust provisions, challenges persist in areas such as cybersquatting, counterfeit enforcement and protracted litigation processes. By comprehending these key provisions and pertinent case laws, businesses can more effectively safeguard their trademarks and navigate the legal complexities of intellectual property rights in India (5, 6, 11).

Results

The Trademark Act of 1999 constitutes a fundamental legislative framework in India, aimed at facilitating the processes of trademark registration, protection, and enforcement. Despite its comprehensive scope, the Act encounters several limitations that hinder its efficacy in addressing contemporary trademark challenges. These limitations include enforcement difficulties, insufficient protection for well-known marks, issues related to cybersquatting, delays in the registration process, and the growing complexities of trademarks, particularly in digital environments (13, 14).

The Trademark Act faces a significant challenge in its enforcement due to inefficiencies. While the Act outlines specific legal remedies for infringement, such as injunctions, damages, and accounts of profits, the actual implementation of these rights is frequently hindered by court backlogs. The Indian legal system is well-known for its lengthy litigation processes, which create substantial obstacles to the prompt resolution of trademark disputes. Trademark owners often endure protracted and expensive legal proceedings, which weakens the deterrent power of trademark laws. Additionally, the burden of proof in trademark infringement cases predominantly falls on the plaintiff, posing difficulties, especially when trying to demonstrate a likelihood of confusion. In the case of Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satya Deo Gupta, the court evaluated factors like phonetic similarity; however, establishing these elements in real-world disputes often requires extensive evidence and expert testimony, further complicating matters for brand proprietors.

The Act provides protection for well-known trademarks, regardless of their registration status in India. However, the process of determining whether a trademark qualifies as "well-known" is inherently subjective, and the Act does not offer clear guidelines for this evaluation. This lack of clarity leads to inconsistent decisions by the courts and the Trademark Registry. For instance, while brands like Tata Sons and Daimler Benz have been acknowledged as well-known trademarks in certain cases, smaller or emerging companies with a significant global presence may struggle to obtain similar protection in India. Moreover, although the Act protects well-known marks from registration or misuse in unrelated industries, it does not sufficiently extend this protection to their online or digital use, particularly in cases of cybersquatting, which involves the unauthorized registration of domain names linked to well-known brands.

The rise of the Internet and e-commerce has introduced significant challenges for trademark holders, particularly in the realm of cybersquatting. Cyber squatters often register domain names that are identical or similar to well-known trademarks, aiming to profit either through resale or by diverting traffic to rival services (15). While the Trademark Act addresses issues of traditional infringement and passing off, it does not contain specific provisions for resolving disputes related to domain names.

The case of Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri exemplifies this issue, as the defendant registered domain names that closely mirrored Tata's trademarks. Although the court ruled in favor of Tata, the judgment was grounded in the principles of passing off rather than a specific statutory framework for domain names. Consequently, trademark holders must rely on alternative legal avenues, such as the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) or the Indian judicial system, to resolve such disputes, which can be both lengthy and expensive (16).

The lack of a clear legislative framework for cybersquatting leaves brand owners vulnerable to the online misuse of their trademarks. Although the Trademark Act of 1999 offers a streamlined process for trademark registration, the actual procedure frequently encounters delays. It may take several years for a trademark to be fully registered due to the backlog at the Trademark Registry. This sluggish pace can disadvantage businesses requiring prompt protection for their marks, particularly in rapidly evolving sectors such as technology, fashion, and media. In the interval between the application and the formal registration of a trademark, businesses face heightened vulnerability to the infringement or unauthorized use of their marks. While legal frameworks permit opposition proceedings subsequent to the mark's publication in the Trademark Journal, these proceedings can prolong the registration timeline, particularly when disputes arise (17). Such delays can undermine the confidence of trademark proprietors and pose substantial risks to enterprises that depend on their trademarks for brand identity and competitive leverage.

India's commitment to international accords, such as the TRIPS Agreement, mandates that its trademark legislation aligns with global norms. Nevertheless, enforcing trademarks across national boundaries presents a significant challenge, particularly for multinational corporations or businesses with a global reach. The Territorial Principle of trademarks, which asserts that a trademark registered in one jurisdiction does not automatically receive protection in another, complicates the efforts of Indian enterprises to secure their trademarks internationally and vice versa (18). Although the Act offers some degree of cross-border protection for well-known marks, it often falls short for companies operating in the global marketplace. Additionally, the expansion of global online platforms exacerbates this issue, as infringing products can be disseminated worldwide without effective mechanisms to curb trademark violations. Although judicial interventions, such as those in Yahoo Inc. v. Akash Arora, have occasionally addressed international trademark enforcement, the limitations of the Trademark Act in this context remain a concern.

The notion of trademark dilution is not thoroughly articulated within Indian legal statutes. Dilution involves the reduction in the distinctiveness of a well-known trademark when it is used in connection with unrelated goods or services. Although the Trademark Act acknowledges the concept of dilution to a limited extent, it lacks detailed statutory provisions, especially concerning non-commercial uses or parodies. In contrast, jurisdictions such as the United States, through the Lanham Act, provide a comprehensive framework for addressing trademark dilution, thereby affording brand owners stronger protection against unauthorized use of their trademarks.

In India, the lack of adequate recognition for trademark dilution represents a substantial challenge for established brands. The unauthorized use of well-known trademarks across different sectors or for non-commercial purposes often fails to receive the necessary legal scrutiny (19), complicating the efforts of brand owners to safeguard their trademarks from dilution. Initially, the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) was established to manage appeals concerning trademark disputes. However, the Tribunal Reforms Act, 2021, led to the dissolution of the IPAB, transferring its responsibilities to the High Courts. This transition is seen as a hindrance to the prompt and specialized resolution of intellectual property disputes. High Courts, already burdened with extensive caseloads, may find it challenging to prioritize trademark disputes, resulting in delays in decision-making and further complicating the enforcement of trademark rights.

The Trademark Act of 1999, despite its comprehensive framework, exhibits significant limitations that undermine its effectiveness in protecting intellectual property rights in India. Challenges such as enforcement difficulties, delays in the registration process, insufficient protection for well-known marks, and the absence of specific provisions for cybersquatting and trademark dilution are among the primary concerns (20). Furthermore, the globalized nature of commerce and the expansion of digital markets introduce new challenges that the Act has yet to fully address. To align with evolving trademark practices and international standards, amendments and reforms are essential to address these limitations and ensure effective trademark protection in India. Delays in interim relief and final adjudication remain significant limitations. The transfer of IPAB functions to High Courts has removed a specialized appellate forum, with mixed effects on speed and specialization. Implementing a structured case-management regime and calibrated costs could enhance deterrence and reduce forum-driven variances.

Regarding Well-Known Marks and Dilution, while the protection of marks with established reputations is acknowledged, the administrative processes for recognition, evidentiary standards, and interaction with online usage remain inadequately codified. Enhanced transparency in criteria, such as market surveys, advertising expenditures, duration and extent of use, and enforcement history, would reduce information costs for applicants and competitors.

Cybersquatting and Domain Names: The judiciary has expanded the doctrine of passing off to encompass domain names, yet the current legislation lacks explicit provisions for addressing domain name registrations conducted in bad faith. Developing a narrowly defined statutory framework that emphasizes confusing similarity, bad faith, and the absence of legitimate interest could streamline and standardize the resolution of domain name disputes.

Non-Traditional Marks and Evidence of Confusion: The evaluation of deceptive similarity primarily hinges on the overall impression and the sophistication of consumers. However, there is a notable underutilization of proportionate consumer surveys and evidence from market contexts by involved parties. Establishing early, court-guided evidentiary standards could provide a more robust empirical foundation for adjudicating close cases.

Empirical Context: Recent official data demonstrate high volumes of filings and disposals at the Registry, along with substantial opposition and examination activities. Nevertheless, the variability in annual filings and the discrepancy between filings and registrations indicate potential for enhancing procedural completeness and minimizing attrition, such as abandonment. Indicators from the years 2022–23 and 2023–24 are elaborated in the Discussion section, with sources appropriately cited.

Comparative and International Alignment (TRIPS, Madrid, EU/US)

TRIPS: The legal framework in India aligns with the core standards of the TRIPS Agreement, addressing aspects such as registrability, rights conferred, exceptions, and enforcement. Articles 15–19 outline the criteria for protectable subject matter, exclusive rights, fair-use exceptions, and usage requirements, whereas Articles 41–61 are dedicated to enforcement protocols. Refining the statutory language on anti-dilution, particularly concerning blurring and tarnishment, could enhance alignment with international practices while remaining consistent with TRIPS (21, 22).

Madrid Protocol: Since 2013, Indian trademark owners have had the capability to designate multiple jurisdictions through a single international application, with India also serving as an Office of the Designated Contracting Party. Advancing digitization and establishing a consistent provisional refusal practice will further leverage the advantages of the Madrid Protocol for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) (23-25).

EU/US Dilution and Non-Traditional Marks: EU regulations protect marks with a reputation from unfair advantage, detriment to distinctiveness, and harm to reputation, with a rigorous evidentiary standard following the Intel decision; US law, under the Trademark Dilution Revision Act (TDRA), applies a likelihood-of-dilution standard and differentiates between blurring and tarnishment. Establishing a codified anti-dilution test and clear evidentiary standards in India would reduce ambiguity and align practices with these international benchmarks (26-29).

Discussion

Recent practical updates include the introduction of published checklists for identifying well-known trademarks, a narrowly tailored anti-cybersquatting provision that addresses confusing similarity, bad faith, and lack of legitimate interest, and the implementation of standardized interim-relief timelines with calibrated costs across intellectual property dockets. Registry indicators, such as filings, examinations, registrations, and renewals, along with experiences from High Court intellectual property lists, support the implementation of targeted case-management and transparency measures to reduce pendency and attrition (22–25, 29–31).

In accordance with the enforcement objectives of the TRIPS Agreement and the dilution practices observed in the EU and US, the establishment of clearer evidentiary thresholds, such as surveys and market-context records, along with codified anti-dilution factors, would help reduce outcome variance and enhance predictability (21–22, 26–29).

Institutional Focus: Procedural and institutional obstacles, including delays, inconsistencies in interim relief, and inadequately detailed evidentiary requirements, play a significant role in influencing outcomes alongside doctrinal rules. The implementation of Intellectual Property Division (IPD) rules in the Delhi High Court offers a model for specialized case management that holds potential for national expansion.

Comparative Lessons: The TRIPS Agreement sets a foundational benchmark for distinctiveness, use, and enforcement, rather than acting as a maximum standard. The European Union's post-Intel standard emphasizes the necessity of clear evidentiary thresholds, while the United States' Trademark Dilution Revision Act (TDRA) exemplifies the benefits of a statutory likelihood-of-dilution test.

Targeted Reforms: Formulate and distribute comprehensive guidance and checklists for the recognition of well-known marks; introduce a statutory, narrowly focused anti-cybersquatting provision; elucidate the factors and defenses related to anti-dilution, including parody and comparative advertising; standardize model intellectual property case-management orders across High Courts; improve Registry analytics concerning examination, opposition, and disposal timelines.

Illustrative Indicators: The CGPDTM Annual Report 2022–23 documented 466,580 trademark applications filed, with ongoing initiatives to reduce pendency. Independent summaries reveal that in 2023–24, approximately 358,111 applications were filed, with 321,760 examined and 250,805 registered, alongside over 120,000 renewals. WIPO statistical resources offer a global perspective and time-series trends that are essential for benchmarking India's activities (30-32).

This analysis examines the doctrinal and practical constraints identified in the findings, situating them within the framework of Indian and comparative trademark law. The primary concern is not the absence of legal mechanisms in the Trade Marks Act, 1999, but rather the inconsistent pace and predictability of their enforcement. Although courts have established clear criteria for deceptive similarity and passing off, case outcomes remain influenced by evidentiary challenges, institutional delays, and the increasing complexity of digital commerce.

Firstly, the adjudicatory timeline presents a significant challenge. The reassignment of appellate responsibilities from the Intellectual Property Appellate Board to High Courts was intended to expedite dispute resolution; however, trademark cases continue to be protracted in many jurisdictions. Such delays undermine the preventive value of injunctions, increase enforcement costs for rights holders, and encourage imitators to exploit the interim period. Implementing early case management, enforcing stricter timelines for interim relief, and adjusting costs could enhance deterrence and minimize forum-driven outcome disparities.

Secondly, the protection of well-known marks underscores the tension between flexible standards and predictable outcomes. Indian courts have consistently safeguarded renowned marks, even across unrelated goods and services, often employing anti-dilution reasoning. However, the process for administrative recognition remains relatively opaque for marks that are strong but not iconic. Enhancing transparency in criteria, providing published guidance on the evidence required from applicants (such as market surveys, advertising expenditure, duration and extent of use, and enforcement history), and maintaining regularly updated public lists would reduce information costs for both owners and competitors.

Thirdly, online misuse reveals a statutory deficiency. Courts have extended the common law action of passing off to domain names and deceptive online identifiers, providing substantial protection against cybersquatting and diversion. However, the absence of an explicit domain-name provision in the Act compels parties to rely on a combination of passing off, interim injunctive relief, and external administrative policies. A narrowly defined statutory framework—centered on bad-faith registration, confusing similarity, and absence of legitimate interest—could yield faster, more consistent results while safeguarding legitimate criticism and fair use online.

Fourthly, the evidentiary framework for confusion analysis would benefit from clearer guidelines. Foundational decisions emphasize the overall impression, purchaser sophistication, the nature of goods and channels of trade, and phonetic and visual similarity. However, in practice, parties often resort to stylistic comparisons in pleadings without contemporaneous consumer evidence. Promoting the use of proportionate consumer surveys and market context records at an early stage—subject to relevance and methodological rigor—could reduce uncertainty and assist courts in resolving close cases on a solid, empirical basis.

Fifth, challenges associated with non-use, rectification, and parallel imports continue to pose compliance difficulties. The statutory non-use period and provision for rectification are crucial regulatory tools for maintaining the integrity of the register. However, they require diligent portfolio management, especially for companies undergoing expansion or rebranding. Regarding exhaustion, the interaction between lawful importation and post-sale obligations is often complex and fact-specific. Therefore, more explicit guidance on quality control and disclosure obligations would help mitigate consumer confusion while preserving the benefits of competition.

Sixth, the legal framework surrounding dilution and non-conventional trademarks in India remains in a developmental phase. Although Indian courts have safeguarded well-known marks from blurring and garnishment, the statutory definition of dilution and its boundaries, such as parody, comparative advertising, and informational use, require further legal elucidation. Similarly, the registrability and enforcement of marks related to shapes, colors, and sounds necessitate more consistent treatment, including practical guidance on distinctiveness and the concept of acquired secondary meaning.

Seventh, capacity limitations outside major urban centers and within small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) contribute to challenges of under-registration and under-enforcement. Targeted outreach initiatives, such as clinics in collaboration with bar associations, simplified guidance materials in regional languages, and increased awareness of fees, can significantly enhance registration rates in India. Concurrently, implementing calibrated costs and predictable timelines would facilitate timely enforcement for SMEs without promoting frivolous litigation.

Finally, coordinated institutional enhancements could yield substantial improvements, such as expanding e-filing capabilities at the Registry, publishing analytics on examination and opposition timelines, and adopting standardized case-management orders for High Court IP lists. Alongside modest statutory amendments, such as explicit rules for domain names, codified criteria for well-known marks, and clarified anti-dilution provisions, these process improvements would enhance the speed, consistency, and perceived legitimacy of outcomes for both rights holders and new market entrants.

In summary, India's trademark system is anchored in doctrinal principles essential for resolving confusion and safeguarding valuable goodwill. The most effective reforms are likely to be incremental and focused, providing clearer guidance where current standards are ambiguous, enacting limited statutory measures to address digital-era challenges, and introducing procedural innovations to expedite relief. These changes would better align enforcement with the dynamics of modern commerce while preserving the Act's balance between exclusive rights and fair competition.

Conclusion

India's intellectual property legal framework is largely sufficient, yet there is room for enhancement through clearer procedures, refined evidentiary standards, and targeted statutory revisions to address digital applications and trademark dilution. Incremental reforms, supported by transparent guidelines and empirical evidence, could streamline legal processes and align outcomes with the evolving landscape of modern commerce.

The Trademark Act of 1999 stands as a cornerstone of India's intellectual property rights system, providing a comprehensive legal framework for trademark registration, protection, and enforcement. Despite its robust structure, the Act encounters several challenges that hinder its effectiveness in today's business environment. These challenges include enforcement difficulties due to judicial delays, ambiguities in the protection of well-known trademarks, the absence of specific provisions for cybersquatting, and complications in cross-border trademark enforcement. Furthermore, the lack of explicit guidelines on trademark dilution and inefficiencies in the registration process present obstacles for businesses aiming to protect their brands in a rapidly changing market.

Significant case laws, such as Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satya Deo Gupta, Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri, and Time Incorporated v. Lokesh Srivastava, have clarified certain aspects of the Act and established precedents in trademark law interpretation. However, these judicial interpretations often expose inherent issues within the legislation, particularly in the context of digital and global business practices. To effectively address contemporary challenges, the Trademark Act requires amendments to bridge these gaps. The growing importance of the digital economy and global trade necessitates more robust and precise provisions for issues such as cybersquatting, cross-border enforcement, and trademark dilution. Additionally, improving the efficiency of the legal process is crucial to mitigate the delays that frequently impede the timely protection of trademark rights.

In conclusion, while the Trademark Act of 1999 serves as a fundamental legal instrument for trademark protection in India, it must evolve to meet the demands of a dynamic, globalized marketplace. By implementing targeted reforms, the Act can be fortified to better protect brand identities and promote business growth in India's modern economy.

Abbreviations

GIs: Geographical Indications, IPAB: Intellectual Property Appellate Board, SMEs: Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, TRIPS: Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, UDRP: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the Maharishi University of Information Technology for providing access to research resources.

Author Contributions

Sukhcharan Singh Chahal: Written Original Draft, K. B. Asthana: Supervise the entire research.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Assistance

The authors declare no use of artificial intelligence (AI) for the write up of the manuscript.

Ethics Approval

Not applicable. This study is a doctrinal legal analysis and did not involve human participants or animals.

Funding

No specific funding was received for this study.

References

1. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) — TRIPS Agreement (full text PDF. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ite1_en.pdf
2. Time Incorporated v Lokesh Srivastava. Delhi High Court; 2005; 30 PTC 3 (Del). https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/56090babe4b01497111752f4
3. ITC Limited v Philip Morris Products SA. Delhi High Court; CS (OS) 1894/2009. https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/56090d34e4b01497111791a4
4. Yahoo! Inc v Akash Arora. Delhi High Court; 1999; IIAD Delhi 229. https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/56090ad1e4b0149711173119
5. Cadila Health Care Ltd v Cadila Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Supreme Court of India; 2001; 2 PTC 541 (SC). https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/5767b129e691cb22da6d53ca
6. Amritdhara Pharmacy v Satya Deo Gupta. Supreme Court of India; 1963; AIR 1963 SC 449. https://indiancaselaw.in/amritdhara-pharmacy-vs-satya-deo-gupta/
7. ICICI Bank Ltd v APS Star Industries Ltd. Supreme Court of India; 2011; CLC 360 (SC). https://api.sci.gov.in/jonew/judis/36993.pdf
8. Tata Sons Ltd v Manu Kosuri. Delhi High Court; 2001; 90 (2001) DLT 659. https://indiancaselaw.in/5307/
9. Daimler Benz AG v Hybo Hindustan. Delhi High Court; 1994; AIR 1994 Delhi 239. https://indiancaselaw.in/daimler-benz-aktiegesellschaft-anr-v-hybo-hindustan/
10. Hardie Trading Ltd v Addisons Paint and Chemicals Ltd. Delhi High Court; 2003; 27 PTC 241 (Del). https://www.casemine.com/judgement/in/5609adcae4b014971141247a
11. The Trade Marks Act, 1999, No. 47 of 1999, Sections 30, 83, https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/15427/1/the_trade_marks_act,_1999.pdf
12. The Tribunals Reforms Act, 2021. Department of Revenue, Ministry of Finance (India). https://dor.gov.in/files/acts_files/The_Tribunals_Reforms_Act_2021.pdf
13. IP and Legal Filings. Parallel imports and its legality under the Trade Marks Act, 1999. 2023. https://www.ipandlegalfilings.com/parallel-imports-and-its-legality-under-the-trade-marks-act-1999/
14. Intepat. Navigating parallel imports: India's approach to the doctrine of exhaustion in IP law. 2024. https://www.intepat.com/blog/navigating-parallel-imports-indias-approach-to-the-doctrine-of-exhaustion-in-ip-law/
15. Singh V. Cybersquatting and trademark law in India. J Intellect Prop Rights. 2015;20(2):85–91.
16. Basheer S. Trademark dilution: a comparative perspective. NALSAR Law Review. 2008;14:1–20.
17. Reddy PT. Trademark infringement and remedies in India. J Intellect Prop Law Pract. 2020;15(3):202–210.
18. Salhotra A. Trademark licensing and quality control: the Indian perspective. J Intellect Prop Rights. 2014;19(6):431–440.
19. Bhandari MN. Legal challenges in protection of well-known trademarks in India. J Intellect Prop Rights. 2011;16(3):213–219.
20. Sakle A. Interplay between trademark and domain name disputes: Indian legal perspective. J Intellect Prop Law Pract. 2014;9(5):345–353.
21. World Trade Organization. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, 1994 (TRIPS Agreement), Articles 15–19 & 41–61. https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_01_e.htm
22. International Trademark Association (INTA). Proving dilution of famous and well-known marks in the EU – Report. 2021. https://www.inta.org/
23. WIPO. India's accession to the Madrid Protocol – presentation. 2016. https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/aspac/en/wipo_tm_tyo_2_16/wipo_tm_tyo_2_16_2_6.pdf
24. IP India & EUIPO. The Madrid Protocol: A route to global branding. 2018. https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/portal/ipoguidelinesmanuals/1_93_1_the_madrid_protocol.pdf
25. IP India. Trade Marks–official portal. https://ipindia.gov.in/trademarks/trademarks
26. Gielen C. Trademark dilution in the European Union. International Trademark Dilution. 2020. https://charlesgielen.com/media/1064/trademark-dilution-in-the-european-union-international-trademark-dilution-2020.pdf
27. Jack Daniel's Properties, Inc v VIP Products LLC. U.S. Supreme Court; 2023. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/22-148_3e04.pdf
28. Practical Law/Thomson Reuters. Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2006 (TDRA) – overview. https://content.next.westlaw.com/
29. EUIPO. Recent case-law summaries – Trade marks. https://www.euipo.europa.eu/en/law/recent-case-law
30. Controller General of Patents, Designs & Trade Marks (CGPDTM). Annual Report 2022–23. https://ipindia.gov.in/writereaddata/Portal/IPOAnnualReport/1_114_1_ANNUAL_REPORT_202223_English.pdf
31. Kan & Krishme via Lexology. Trademark landscape 2023–24: Progress, challenges and the road ahead. 2025. https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=e6c0522a-430b-4318-a3a7-8718895cd1b9
32. WIPO. IP Statistics – World Intellectual Property Indicators/IP Facts & Figures. https://www.wipo.int/en/web/ip-statistics

How to Cite: Chahal SS, Asthana KB. An Analysis of the Limitations of the Trademarks Law in India: Challenges and Perspectives. Int Res J Multidiscip Scope. 2025; 6(4):186-195. doi: 10.47857/irjms.2025.v06i04.07633