



\$~58

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

+ **CS(COMM) 328/2024 & I.A. 31158/2025**

**NETWORK18 MEDIA & INVESTMENTS LIMITED.....Plaintiff**

Through: Ms. Abhilasha Nautiyal & Ms. Tarun  
Tripathy, Advs

versus

**KRISHNAA @ JAGTAR SINGH & ORS. ....Defendants**

Through: Ms. Swati Agarwal, Mr.  
Shashank Mishra, Mr. Vaarish  
Sawani, Ms. Akshi Rastogi, Ms.  
Rithika Mathur & Ms. Anupamaa  
Reddy Eleti, Advs. for  
D-22/WhatsApp.

Mr. Syed Urfee Haider, Adv. For  
D-24/Bharti Airtel Ltd. (through VC)

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA**

**ORDER**

**% 19.12.2025**

**Factual Matrix**


1. The Plaintiff, a part of the Network18 group of companies, is a financial news and information services company that uses the trademark "MONEYCONTROL" for its services. These services are also offered to the public through the Plaintiff's website "www.moneycontrol.com", mobile applications and social media channels.



2. The Plaintiff has secured registrations for the trademark



“Moneycontrol” and its formative versions, including “

“Moneycontrol+”, “Moneycontrol Plus”, “  ” and

“moneycontrol.com” in classes 09, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, and 45 *inter alia* in relation to financial affairs, digital platforms and applications *qua* finance, etc. The details of registrations are mentioned in paragraph no. 7 of the plaint.

3. The present suit concerns the use of Plaintiff’s MONEY CONTROL marks by Defendants No. 1 to 21, who as per the Plaintiff falsely claim to be affiliated with the Plaintiff and offering financial investment tips.

4. It is stated that in March 2024, Plaintiff started receiving several complaints on its grievance redressal email ID and online portals, relating to unsolicited messages being sent to the public by Defendants Nos. 1 to 21, who wrongfully represented themselves to be Plaintiff’s employees and asked unwary consumers to join the WhatsApp group titled “CINV- The Premier Strategy Group” and/or its group name variations, for stock market trading tips, insights, insider tips, stock diagnostic analysis etc.

5. It is stated that in these groups, Defendants No. 1 to 21 made false representations that their ‘CINV’ initiative is co-sponsored by the Plaintiff, ICICI Bank, Punjab National Bank, and other brokerage firms. To mislead the consumers, the Defendants in the WhatsApp group offered luxurious gifts, including providing expected yields of “*over 30% profits in a week with explosive short-term stock*”. Purportedly, a professor named Mr. Dev Shah offered training to the unwary consumer enabling securing a 500% return on investment. The Defendants made a false claim pertaining to launch a mutual



fund titled 'CINV INDIA No.1' on 23.08.2024 with an aim to raise '30 Billion'.

6. It is further stated that it is Defendants Nos. 1 to 18 who approached unsuspecting members of the public to join the said WhatsApp groups, while Defendants Nos. 19 and 20 were the group administrators of the WhatsApp group "CINV- the Premier Strategy Group No. 84". And, Defendant No. 21 sent a fraudulent message on the WhatsApp group(s) falsely claiming that CINV is co-sponsored by the Plaintiff.

7. It is stated that aggrieved by the aforesaid illegal and unauthorised acts of the Defendants, the Plaintiff was constrained to file the captioned suit.

8. Learned counsel for the Plaintiff has submitted that the suit may be disposed of in terms of the prayer clause 37(i) to (iii) of the plaint as well as in terms of the directions in paragraph 22 of the order dated 25.04.2025 against the Defendants 1 to 21.

9. The Plaintiff has filed a note of submissions dated 13.12.2025 and note on directions dated 19.12.2025 sought qua all the Defendants.

#### **Overview of Proceedings**

10. The Court vide ad-interim order dated 25.04.2024, which was confirmed on 17.09.2025, has already enjoined the Defendant nos. 1 to 21 from using the impugned marks.

11. Vide order dated 25.04.2024, this Court passed several directions against Defendant No. 22 (WhatsApp LLC), Defendant No. 23 (Vodafone Idea Limited), Defendant No. 24 (Bharti Airtel Limited), Defendant No. 25 (Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited) and Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (which was arrayed as Defendant No. 25 and subsequently deleted from the array of parties vide order dated 02.12.2024), inter alia, directing them to temporarily



block the mobile numbers and WhatsApp groups and accounts associated with Defendant Nos. 1 to 21.

12. Defendant Nos. 1 to 21 were duly served through electronic/digital mode on 01.05.2024 at the mobile numbers mentioned in the memo of parties. Despite valid service, none of the said Defendants have entered appearance since the institution of the present suit; and, consequently, vide order dated 12.09.2024, this Court closed the right of Defendant Nos. 1 to 21 to file their written statements. The defendants were proceeded ex parte by order dated 17.09.2025.

**Court's Analysis:**

13. The Court has heard the counsel for the Plaintiff and perused the record of the present matter.

14. This Court has reviewed the pleadings and the documents. On a bare perusal the infringement activities conducted by the infringing Defendant Nos. 1 to 21, it is evident that these Defendants sent messages to customers via WhatsApp as part of a scheme to deceive them into transferring substantial sums of money. The activities of the Defendants establish a clear intention of showing a direct nexus or affiliation with the Plaintiff and making a misrepresentation that its services have been licensed or approved or endorsed by the Plaintiff.

15. Defendant Nos. 1 to 21 have not sought the vacation or modification of the aforesaid injunction order dated 25.04.2024 or defended these proceedings. The said Defendants also did not approach the telecom service provider or WhatsApp to enquire about the blocking of the mobile numbers evidencing their lack of interest in defending these proceedings, which also lends credence to the averments of misrepresentation made in the plaint.



16. The learned Joint Registrar vide order dated 12.09.2024 has recorded that despite service, no written statement has been filed on behalf of Defendant Nos. 1 to 21. Further, vide order dated 17.09.2025, this Court proceeded Defendant Nos. 1 to 21, ex-parte.

17. In view of the aforesaid, it is clear that all the averments made in the plaint and documents filed with the plaint are deemed to admitted. At this stage, it would be apposite to refer to Order VIII Rule 10 of CPC. The said rule reads as under: -

**“10. Procedure when party fails to present written statement called for by Court.—** Where any party from whom a written statement is required under rule 1 or rule 9 fails to present the same within the time permitted or fixed by the Court, as the case may be, the Court shall pronounce judgment against him, or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit and on the pronouncement of such judgment a decree shall be drawn up.”

18. Furthermore, Defendants affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the Plaintiff is not on record. Accordingly, the documents filed by the Plaintiff are deemed to have been admitted by Defendants as per Rule 4 of Chapter VII of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

19. It would be relevant to refer to the dicta of **Satya Infrastructure Ltd. & Ors. v. Satya Infra & Estates Pvt. Ltd.**<sup>1</sup>, wherein the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court held that in matters where the defendant is proceeded ex-parte, the Court, upon its satisfaction, can pass a decree for permanent injunction on the basis of the pleadings filed on affidavit. The relevant part of the order reads as under: -

“4. The next question which arises is whether this Court should consider the application for interim relief and direct the plaintiffs to lead ex parte evidence. The counsel for the plaintiff’s states that

---

<sup>1</sup>2013 SCC OnLine Del 508



the plaintiffs are willing to give up the reliefs of delivery, of rendition of accounts and of recovery of damages, if the suit for the relief of injunction alone were to be heard today.

5. I am of the opinion that no purpose will be served in such cases by directing the plaintiffs to lead ex parte evidence in the form of affidavit by way of examination-in chief and which invariably is a repetition of the contents of the plaint. The plaint otherwise, as per the amended CPC, besides being verified, is also supported by affidavits of the plaintiffs. I fail to fathom any reason for according any additional sanctity to the affidavit by way of examination-in-chief than to the affidavit in support of the plaint or to any exhibit marks being put on the documents which have been filed by the plaintiffs and are already on record. I have therefore heard the counsel for the plaintiffs on merits qua the relief of injunction.”

(Emphasis supplied)

20. In the aforementioned facts and the settled law noted above, given the fact that the plaint has been duly verified and is supported by the affidavit(s) of the Plaintiff as well the Statement of Truth, this Court is of the view that this suit does not merit trial. This Court deems it fit to opine that the present suit is capable of being decreed in terms of Order VIII rule 10 of CPC.

21. In view thereof, the Plaintiff is entitled to relief of permanent injunction as claimed in the plaint. Accordingly, a decree of permanent injunction is hereby passed in terms of paragraph 22 of the injunction order dated 25.04.2024 in favour of the plaintiff and against defendant nos. 1 to 21.

22. The remaining reliefs of damages and legal costs are disposed of as not pressed.

**Directions qua the proforma Defendants**

23. The suit qua remaining defendant nos. 22 to 25, which are the proforma parties, also stand disposed of with the following directions:



23.1. The Plaintiff, while addressing its arguments on 12.12.2025, had sought a prayer for permanent blocking of the number of infringing Defendant Nos. 1 to 21. However, the Plaintiff fairly conceded that it does not have any proprietary claims on these mobile numbers and permanent restraint was sought only to control the fraudulent activities of the infringing Defendants.

23.2. The relief of permanent blocking of mobile number was prayed for against Defendant No. 22/WhatsApp LLC, Defendant No. 23/Vodafone Idea Limited and Defendant No. 24/Bharti Airtel Limited as well as Defendant No. 25/Reliance Jio Infocomm Limited. Upon enquiry from the Court, the telecom service providers (TSPs) and WhatsApp clarified that they have a mechanism for supervising that these numbers remain blocked for a definite period of time, say one [1] year. This Court was of the considered opinion that passing a direction for blocking the infringing mobile numbers for a limited period of further one [1] year would be sufficient to achieve the intent of the relief of permanent injunction prayed for against Defendant Nos. 1 to 21. The Plaintiff also agreed to this direction for blocking the infringing mobile numbers for a limited period of further one [1] year.

23.3. In these facts, considering that mobile numbers are a finite resource for the TSPs and the Plaintiff does not have any proprietary rights in this number, this Court is of the considered opinion that the relief of permanent injunction prayed for in this suit against the infringing Defendants does not necessitate permanently blocking the mobile number for controlling its misuse against fraud.

The mobile numbers were blocked vide interim injunction order dated 25.04.2024 and have not been permitted to be used by the infringing



Defendants since then; one and a half years have since lapsed. In the considered opinion of this Court, by extending the blocking period for a further period of one [1] year, it shall work as a sufficient cooling period and act as a disincentive to the infringing Defendants to use these mobile numbers.

Further, the direction to the TSPs not to issue/allot this mobile number to the infringing Defendant on the same KYC details will also act as a sufficient safeguard. So also, WhatsApp will continue to maintain a block on the mobile numbers for a further period of one [1] year.

23.4. Accordingly, Defendant no. 22/ WhatsApp LLC is directed to block the WhatsApp accounts of the infringing defendant nos. 1-9,12, 14-18 and 21 mentioned at ANNEXURE-A attached along with this order, for a period of 1 year from the date of this order. This mechanism is meant to ensure that should the underlying phone number get relocated to any other user by the TSPs in accordance with the directions of the court, such a new user is not permanently precluded from registering a WhatsApp account.

Further, defendant no. 22 is directed to permanently block one (1) WhatsApp Group mentioned in ANNEXURE-B attached along with this order.

23.5. Defendant no. 23/Vodafone Idea Limited is directed to deactivate/block the phone number 80542 86968 of Defendant no. 1/ Krishnaa @Jagtar Singh, for a period of 1 year from the date of passing of this order and not to reallocate the said number to the KYC holder as disclosed in compliance with the order dated 25.04.2024, even when the number is reallocated in the future.





23.6. Defendant no. 24/ Bharti Airtel Limited is directed to deactivate/block the phone numbers of defendant nos. 2, 3, 7, 10, 12 and 21, as mentioned in ANNEXURE-C attached along with this order, for a period of 1 year from the date of passing of this order and to not reallocate the said numbers to the KYC holder as disclosed in compliance with the order dated 25.04.2024, even when the number is reallocated in the future.

23.7. Defendant no. 25/Reliance JIO Infocomm Limited is directed to deactivate/block the phone numbers of defendant nos. 5, 6, 8, 11, 13 and 16-18, as mentioned in ANNEXURE-D attached along with this order, for a period of 1 year from the date of passing of this order, and not to reallocate the said numbers to the KYC holder as disclosed in compliance with order dated 25.04.2024 even when the number is reallocated in the future.

23.8. Needless to state that if the Plaintiff learns of any future illegal activities on the same mobile numbers, it will be at liberty to file appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

23.9. The Plaintiff's right to claim damages cause to it from the cause of action set out in the plaint against the individuals or legal entities that may be identified to be responsible, is hereby reserved and the prayer clause 37(xi) of the plaint for the relief of damages is disposed of as withdrawn with the said liberty.

24. With the aforesaid directions, this suit, along with pending applications (if any), stands disposed of.

25. The registry is directed to draw up a decree in terms of this order.

26. All future dates stand cancelled.

27. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, [www.delhihighcourt.nic.in](http://www.delhihighcourt.nic.in), shall be treated



as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of the order shall be insisted upon by any authority/entity or litigant.

**MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J**  
**DECEMBER 19, 2025**



**ANNEXURE-A**

<b>Defendant Name and Phone Number</b>	<b>Defendant No.</b>
<b>1. Krishnaa @Jagtar Singh</b> Phone: 80542 86968	<b>Defendant No. 1</b>
<b>2. Prem @Pan</b> Phone: 72958 03863	<b>Defendant No. 2</b>
<b>3. Saanvi @Nantha Thambi</b> Phone: 80158 74606	<b>Defendant No. 3</b>
<b>4. Nisha @Ijhar</b> Phone: 85802 41432	<b>Defendant No. 4</b>
<b>5. Geeta @Om Prakash Sahu</b> Phone: 62610 72873	<b>Defendant No. 5</b>
<b>6. Maryam @Chudamani Seth</b> Phone: 82608 22374	<b>Defendant No. 6</b>
<b>7. Vidya @Guljar Khan</b> Phone: 99298 37956	<b>Defendant No. 7</b>
<b>8. Kareena @Suman Kumar</b> Phone: 9508564675 Email: skk852131@gmail.com	<b>Defendant No. 8</b>
<b>9. Shreya @Kalyan Ghule</b> Phone: 8550902537	<b>Defendant No. 9</b>
<b>10. @Suresh Benni</b> Phone: 88610 73651	<b>Defendant No. 12</b>
<b>11. Priyanka Kadam @Achu A.</b> Phone: 7902458409	<b>Defendant No. 14</b>
<b>12. Nithya @Pooja and Kuldeep Verma</b> Phone: 9554112367	<b>Defendant No. 15</b>
<b>13. Nitya @Memories Studio Rewa</b> Phone: 9131454554	<b>Defendant No. 16</b>
<b>14. Bhanupriya Khalsa @Lakhn</b> Phone: 7489490052	<b>Defendant No. 17</b>
<b>15. Ajuk Majhi</b> Phone: 93957 48231	<b>Defendant No. 18</b>



<b>16. Kalista Sharma @Shailesh Joshi</b> Phone numbers: 9773671577 8121694901	<b>Defendant No. 21</b>
---	-------------------------

### **ANNEXURE-B**

<b>Whatsapp Group Name</b>	<b>Link</b>	<b>Admin Details</b>
CINV – the premier strategy group No.84	<a href="https://chat.whatsapp.com/EsBJ&amp;sS2zvAF8hTYdTK6e2">https://chat.whatsapp.com/EsBJ&amp;sS2zvAF8hTYdTK6e2</a>	Defendant No.19 <b>Sanjay@Raheman</b> Phone: 76003 68291  Defendant No.20 <b>Atharvan</b> Phone: 95811 65471



### **ANNEXURE-C**

<b>Defendant Name and Phone Number</b>	<b>Defendant No.</b>
<b>1. Prem @Pan</b> Phone: 72958 03863	<b>Defendant No. 2</b>
<b>2. Saanvi @Nantha Thambi</b> Phone: 80158 74606	<b>Defendant No. 3</b>
<b>3. Vidya @Guljar Khan</b> Phone: 99298 37956	<b>Defendant No. 7</b>
<b>4. Aswi @Ram Dev</b> Phone: 9958915314	<b>Defendant No. 10</b>
<b>5. @Suresh Benni</b> Phone: 88610 73651	<b>Defendant No. 12</b>
<b>6. Kalista Sharma @Shailesh Joshi</b> Phone numbers: 9773671577; 8121694901	<b>Defendant No. 21</b>



### **ANNEXURE-D**

<b>Defendant Name and Phone Number</b>	<b>Defendant No.</b>
<b>1. Geeta @Om Prakash Sahu</b> Phone: 62610 72873	<b>Defendant No. 5</b>
<b>2. Maryam @Chudamani Seth</b> Phone: 82608 22374	<b>Defendant No. 6</b>
<b>3. Kareena @Suman Kumar</b> Phone: 9508564675 Email: skk852131@gmail.com	<b>Defendant No. 8</b>
<b>4. Harsha Kumar @Tuna Sir</b> Phone: 9265188302	<b>Defendant No. 11</b>
<b>5. Manjari Brar @A. Khan</b> Phone: 9832653151	<b>Defendant No. 13</b>
<b>6. Nitya @Memories Studio Rewa</b> Phone: 9131454554	<b>Defendant No. 16</b>
<b>7. Bhanupriya Khalsa @Lakhn</b> Phone: 7489490052	<b>Defendant No. 17</b>
<b>8. Ajuk Majhi</b> Phone: 93957 48231	<b>Defendant No. 18</b>