# The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896



## TRADEMARK PROTECTION IN THE DIGITAL AGE

***~Kriti Tyagi***

### ABSTRACT

*The significance of trademarks has undergone a significant transformation in the contemporary digital era. Trademarks that are considered the symbols of consumer faith, brand reputation and attached business goodwill are no longer confined to mere intangible assets. Online social media platforms have intensified the role of trademarks by becoming an indicator of commercial promotions, earning profits and marketing. However, the increasing expansion of technology-driven platforms has created complex challenges for the enforcement of trademark protection. The misuse of brand identities, unauthorised logos, hashtags, Artificial Intelligence-generated content, fake domain name registrations, etc. poses significant difficulties for the rights holders. The existing trademark framework is primarily modelled for the traditional environment as it struggles to address the challenges posed by today's digital dynamics.*

*The research paper examines the Indian Trade Mark Protection framework through a doctrinal approach, focusing primarily on social media infringement, cybersquatting, intermediary liability, domain name registrations, misleading advertisements and the impact of AI on trademark enforcement. While the judiciary and legislature have contributed significantly to understanding and enforcing the existing trademark regime to answer the questions that have surfaced in the digital world, the current trademark regime is not equipped to sufficiently handle the new forms of online infringement, especially on digital platforms and new technologies. The study therefore highlights the urgent need for comprehensive measures to boost protection and enforcement of trademark rights in the digital age.*

**Keywords**: Trademark infringement, online platforms, counterfeit products, intermediary liability

## INTRODUCTION

The expansion of the digital economy has transformed the framework of trademark protection. As businesses increasingly rely on online platforms for their brand promotions and visibility to earn profits and strengthen their consumer reach, these developments have posed a significant challenge for widespread misuse of trademarks. For instance, the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has intensified the replication of logos and signs that closely imitate the original trademarks, thereby exposing risks for trademark protection in the legal regime.

The evolution of the digital ecosystem has introduced novel challenges to the effective enforcement of trademark rights. The anonymity of online users, rapid dissemination of content, and increasing involvement of intermediaries, including hosting providers and Internet service providers, have challenged the traditional enforcement mechanisms of trademark rights. As a result, it requires the courts and legislatures to address the realities of online infringement. Nevertheless, the unresolved issue is of the allocation of legal responsibility to whom it should be imposed on – the original uploader, the hosting platform, search engines or a combination of these actors for acts of online trademark infringement.

Moreover, the internet's global reach poses significant challenges to the territorial scope of trademarks. Despite efforts by international instruments, including the TRIPS Agreement and the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO), to harmonise trademark protection, significant challenges persist in addressing the complexities of digital infringement. The increasing integration of global e-commerce underscores the necessity for a comprehensive cross-border regulatory mechanism capable of ensuring trademark protection along with market accessibility and innovation.

The Trade Marks Act, 1999 forms the cornerstone of trademark protection in India and provides a strong legal basis through legal remedies. Despite its comprehensive framework, it has left several aspects of digital trademark infringement inadequately addressed. While the judiciary and regulatory authorities remain largely active in this regard, these judicial responses cannot alone fully tackle issues such as cybersquatting, intermediary liability and misleading online advertising. Therefore, a more coherent and future-oriented framework is required to ensure effective trademark protection.

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

The main aim of this research paper is to look at the role of the changing trademark law in the new digitally occupied environments and to see the problems of digital infringement in today's globalised online platforms.

The scope of the study primarily focuses on examining the statutory provisions of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and exploring the challenges arising in the enforcement of trademark protection in the rapidly increasing digital era. Additionally, it examines the crucial judicial responses by the Indian Courts in regard to the difficulties involved in online spaces pertaining to trademark law. The issues include cybersquatting, Artificial Intelligence-generated content, virtual assets and online trademark infringement. Through this analysis, the research aims to recommend technological reforms in today’s digital times to strengthen the trademark protection regime in India.

## 1. TRADEMARK PROTECTION UNDER INDIAN LAW

### 1.1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND EVOLUTION

Trademarks have been a part of Indian legal history since 1940. The Trade Marks Act, 1940 was inspired by the British Trade Marks Act of 1938. Subsequently, the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958 was enacted to consolidate the various provisions for registration, protection and enforcement of trademarks. The real turning point came about in the year 1999 when the Trade Marks Act, 1999 superseded the earlier law to make India compliant with the TRIPS Agreement and to align the IP regime with the international standards.

### 1.2. MEANINGS AND PROVISIONS OF THE TRADEMARKS ACT, 1999

A trademark is usually understood to be a distinctive commercial sign made up of a symbol, word, phrase or design which allows a consumer to distinguish certain goods or services from goods or services provided by other companies. The definition of trademark can be found in Section 2(1) (zb) of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, which defines a trademark to be any mark that can be represented graphically and is capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one person from those of another. Under Sections 9 and 11 of the Act, the registration of marks that are identical, deceptively similar or contrary to public morality is prohibited under the provision.

To align trademark enforcement with the modernised technological advancements, the Trade Marks Rules, 2017 [1]govern the procedural reforms by facilitating electronic filings, digital record management and digital opposition proceedings. These rules were introduced to enable trademark registration to be more efficient and user-friendly. The administration of the trademark registry is operated under the control of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks (CGPTDM), who maintains the official records of registered trademarks and their proprietors. A registered trademark remains valid for an initial term of ten years and may be renewed indefinitely for ten-year terms in accordance with the provisions of the Act.[2]

### 1.3. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

The enforcement mechanism under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 reflects a balanced approach through legal remedies – civil and criminal remedies laid down to protect the trademark owner's proprietary interests and prevent unauthorised commercial use of registered trademarks. Under Sections 134 and 135[3]courts are empowered to grant numerous reliefs like injunctions, damages, monetary compensation and destruction of counterfeit goods. In addition to civil remedies, the Act provides criminal penalties for infringing activities like false application of trademarks and dealing in goods bearing unauthorised trademarks. Complementing both the civil and criminal remedies, the Act recognised the John Doe orders granted by the courts where the infringer's identity is unknown. These proceedings are generally ex parte given the urgency of the matter.

## 2. CHALLENGES IN THE DIGITAL AGE

As the Trade Marks Act is based on traditional markets, trademark owners are faced with many problems in the context of the speed, scale and anonymity of online infringers. As a result, such types of digital interaction have the potential to affect the consumer perception of the brand and result in damage to the brand, reputation and goodwill of the original trademark holder**.**

### 2.1. CYBERSQUATTING, TYPOSQUATTING AND DOMAIN NAME DISPUTES

One of the major concerns is the registration of domain names which are identical or confusingly similar to registered trademarks, especially when the registration of such trademarks is done to reap profit from resale and to cause confusion among

[1] The Trade Marks Rules, 2017, Ministry of Commerce & Industry
[2] Trade Marks Act, No. 47 of 1999, India Code
[3] Trade Marks Act, No. 47 of 1999, § 134 & 135, India Code

consumers, resulting in their misguided. In addition to this, the domain name is created with a slight spelling variation to deceive the users.

### 2.2. E-COMMERCE PLATFORMS AND PHISHING

E-commerce platforms like Amazon, Flipkart and eBay have revolutionised consumer access but present unique enforcement issues for trademarks. For instance – Selling and trade deals of unauthorised counterfeit products under the trademark's identity. It is witnessed that, just to steal confidential information, fake websites are created replicating the original trademark.

### 2.3. NON-FUNGIBLE TOKENS (NFTS)

They are digital assets that are based on blockchain technology and are characterised by their distinctive identifier that can create a record of authenticity and ownership. This covers digital paintings, music and virtual goods. This type of NFT has now more commonly sold on online marketplaces, often using cryptocurrencies.

### 2.4. SOCIAL MEDIA, INFLUENCER MARKETING AND USER-GENERATED CONTENT

Social Media has become a platform of its own to promote a brand, and also become a place to commit trademark violations. Using a trademark in 'usernames', 'hashtags' or 'display names', particularly by influencers or online sellers, without permission. It establishes false links between the trademark owner and the infringer.

One of the concerns that has been raised that social media platforms like Instagram, Facebook and YouTube enable users to generate content featuring trademarks and influencers use the same in their own interests. Unauthorised use, or the use of brand names without permission, may constitute unauthorised trademark infringement, since influencers may be using counterfeit products or a brand's name without the owner's consent.

### 2.5. KEYWORD-BASED ADVERTISING ON SEARCH ENGINES

The ability of advertisers to use trademarks and brand names as keywords for search engine advertising has created a new set of challenges under trademark law. These practices have resulted in consumer confusion through the unauthorised use of the trademark of the true owner. Indian courts have responded to these issues, adopting a pragmatic approach in the interest of fair competition and trademark goodwill.

### 2.6. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-DRIVEN CONTENT GENERATION

Artificial Intelligence can generate copyrighted texts and designs, brand logos and names that implicitly mirror the registered trademarks. The emerging use of AI-driven technologies has introduced significant liability for infringement arising from AI-generated content, as it is difficult to prove infringement as there is an absence of a regulatory framework in this regard. Equally challenging is determining the question regarding whether the liability should remain with the user or the platform. Additionally, it raises important question how should court develop appropriate standards to assess bad faith where infringement results from automated AI-driven processes.

### 2.7. INTERMEDIARY LIABILITY

The question of intermediary liability is a critical issue in determining the legal liability of the platform and the content shared by the users. Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 [4]prescribes the safe harbour protection to intermediaries. This is contingent upon the mechanism laid down, i.e. adherence in regard to the interests of the rights holder and preventing online infringement.

The revised framework of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 significantly transformed the framework governing intermediaries. However, these rules are nothing short of limitations :

### 2.8. UNCERTAINTIES SURROUNDING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION

Intellectual property infringement, particularly trademark violations, is not expressly laid down under these rules. As a result, this absence of Intellectual Property Protection-related provision creates an unclear standard pertaining to the obligations of intermediaries. Therefore, platforms develop their own approach thereby, end up infringing the trademarks.

### 2.9. TERRITORIAL LIMITATIONS IN DIGITAL TRADEMARK DISPUTES

The borderless nature of online platforms presents multifaceted challenges for the enforcement of trademark rights. The trademark owners are faced with difficulties as intermediary obligations are governed by diverse laws and thereby, leaving the rights holders in securing effective remedies because of gaps in cross-border trademark protection

## 3. CHALLENGES FACED BY THE JUDICIARY

[4] Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, § 79, INDIA CODE

The judiciary has made significant progress towards safeguarding trademarks in digital spaces. However, the courts still face several legal challenges with regard to online trademark disputes :

**3.1. JURISDICTIONAL UNCERTAINTY**: The borderless nature of the internet makes it difficult to determine the appropriate forum for disputes.

**3.2. UNIDENTIFIED INFRINGERS**: The identification of infringers is particularly difficult who operates from anonymous accounts,

**3.3. LARGE-SCALE DIGITAL INFRINGEMENT**: Courts are required to address the enormous volume of online listings, domain name registrations and brand dilutions, which has made litigation burdensome and inefficient to address the same.

**3.4. TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT**: The emergence of technologies such as Artificial Intelligence and Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs) has given rise to unprecedented legal uncertainties. Courts must therefore adopt a progressive approach to address these challenges, supported by a combination of statutory reforms that remain responsive to technological advancements,

## 4. JUDICIAL RESPONSES IN INDIA

The judiciary has assumed a significant role in shaping trademark jurisprudence, particularly in addressing the increasing instances of digital infringement. While the Trade Marks Act, 1999 establishes the foundation of trademark protection, judicial interpretation has played a pivotal role in extending its application to address contemporary challenges posed by online commerce, cybersquatting, e-commerce platforms, social media and emerging technologies. This chapter examines doctrinal evolution and key judicial principles that define India's response to trademark issues in the digital age.

## 5. LANDMARK CASES IN ONLINE TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

The Indian judiciary has consistently applied traditional trademark principles distinctiveness, goodwill and likelihood of confusion to digital contexts.

### 5.1. YAHOO! INC. V. AKASH ARORA & ANR. (1999)[5]

The Delhi High Court recognised that the defendant's registration of "yahooindia.com" constituted a violation by misappropriating the goodwill and reputation of the trademark owner, which is internationally recognised. Therefore, the court concluded that it created consumer confusion in the virtual environment and,

[5] *Yahoo! Inc. v. Akash Arora & Anr,* (1999) PTC 201 (Del HC).

therefore, a passing-off order is fully relevant for trademark protection in the digital ecosystem.

### 5.2. TATA SONS LTD. V. MANU KOSURI (2001)[6]

In this trailblazing case, the Delhi High Court held that use of the well-known trademarks in domain names constitutes a serious violation of trademark rights and infringement on the brand's reputation and trademark distinctiveness; therefore, infringement on trademark is met with infringement in the digital space.

### 5.3. CHRISTIAN LOUBOUTIN SAS V. NAKUL BAJAJ (2018)

The court reinforced the principle that E-commerce platforms cannot remain passive and must implement due diligence and takedown mechanisms. The court addressed counterfeit products sold online, reiterating that intermediaries have a duty to act upon knowledge of infringement[7].

### 5.4. AMAZON VS BEVERLY HILLS POLO CLUB (2025)

The Delhi HC addressed the principle of intermediary accountability, ordering Amazon to prevent sales of counterfeit goods and highlighting the judiciary's proactive stance in protecting trademarks in e-commerce. These cases collectively demonstrate the judiciary's adaptation of conventional doctrines to the digital age. Courts have shown willingness to expand the scope of trademark law, particularly in areas where statutory provisions are silent.[8]

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND TECHNOLOGICAL REFORMS

The rapid evolution of social media platforms has expanded the scope of trademark infringement that requires a more technologically driven approach. Misuses such as cybersquatting, domain registrations, AI-generated content, virtual goods and counterfeiting of trademarks highlight the urgent need for institutional reforms.

### 6.1. EXPLICIT TRADEMARK LEGISLATION

The statutory act should be amended to address the complexities faced by the rights holder in the emerging digital spaces. This should include domain name registrations, AI-generated content, keyword advertising and virtual assets. Such explicit

[6] *Tata Sons Ltd. v. Manu Kosuri & Ors, 90* (2001*)* DLT 659.

[7] *Christian Louboutin SAS v. Nakul Bajaj*, (2018) SCC OnLine Del 13041.

[8] Reuters, *India Court Orders Amazon to Pay $39 Million in Damages in Beverly Hills Polo Club Case* (Feb. 26, 2025), https://www.reuters.com/business/retail consumer/india-court-orders-amazon-pay-39-million-damages-beverly-hills-polo club-case-2025-02-26/.

recognition would provide guidance to judicial authorities in determining the outcome of digital trademark infringement.

**6.2. STRONGER PROTECTION AGAINST CYBERSQUATTING**

Indian legislative framework should develop a dedicated statutory code with a similar approach adopted by the United States Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA). [9]This would certainly help proprietors in speedy trial, monetary damages and the recovery of infringing domain names.

**6.3. ACCOUNTABILITY OF INTERMEDIARIES**

Legislative reform is needed for the purpose of clarification in regard to Intellectual Property obligations under Section 79 of the Information Technology Act, 2000[10]. The amendment should impose liability on the intermediaries when trademark violations are found. The amendment can include:

- Cooperation with trademark owners
- Introduction of takedown mechanisms for trademark infringers.

**6.4. VERIFICATION BADGES FOR AUTHENTIC USERS**

Social media entities should establish authentication systems by using verification badges that help consumers differentiate the genuine brands from the brands used by infringers. This, in turn, will help develop a more effective trademark protection framework capable of addressing the challenges arising in the digital ecosystem.

**6.5. AI- BASED MONITORING MECHANISM**

The adoption of artificial intelligence-based monitoring systems to enable rights holders in the detection of unauthorised logos, counterfeit products and fraudulent digital content.

**6.6. PREVENTIVE MEASURES**

In the online marketplace, prevention is one of the most effective mechanisms for safeguarding trademarks.

**6.7. DOMAIN NAMES**

A robust strategy includes early registration of domain names, which minimises the risk of cybersquatting and other forms of online misuse. Such proactive measures prevent trademark disputes.

**6.8. ACTIVE MONITORING**

[9] Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA), 15 U.S.C. §§ 1125(d) (1999)
[10] Supra 6

An effective trademark protection strategy requires continuous monitoring of online platforms to identify potential infringements at an early stage. Early detection enables the detection of fake social media profiles, counterfeit products, etc., and in turn helps proprietors to pursue appropriate legal remedies and ensure takedown mechanisms.

### 6.9. SAFEGUARDING DIGITAL ASSETS

A robust cybersecurity measure alongside legal remedies such as domain-based message identification alert, multi-factor authentication, Domain Name System Security Extensions, DomainKeys Identified Mail to enhance the security in the digital platform. In addition to this, organisations should govern themselves by establishing internal policies to prevent unauthorised access and misuse**.** These practices strengthen trademark protection and support the effective enforcement of trademark rights in online spaces.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The rapid growth of digital platforms has transformed them into powerful commercial centres, thereby significantly altering the scope of trademark protection. While this transformation has created new opportunities in the era of globalisation, it has exposed several inadequacies within the existing legal framework, specifically in addressing the complexities faced in the forms of online infringement. The statutory framework, such as the Trade Marks Act, 1999 and the Information Technology Act, 2000, provides legal remedies, but these acts struggle to provide remedies in regard to digital media-related trademark infringement and therefore highlights the urgent need for legislative reform and development.

Indian judicial authorities have played a proactive role in protecting trademark rights but judicial responses cannot stand alone to overcome the limitations of the current regime. In the absence of a clear statutory framework and effective technological reform, trademark proprietors will continue to face obstacles in safeguarding their trademarks.

Therefore, the future of trademark protection in India requires a holistic approach to promote clear legal standards and solutions, judicial responses and technological reforms to balance out the rights of the true owners as well as intermediaries. Such reforms are essential to provide effective and future-oriented trademark protection in the increasingly evolving digital era.