

If social media publications are prima facie false & disparaging that harms the goodwill and reputation attached to a well-known trademark, and if such content has unrestricted digital reach capable of causing continuing commercial and reputational injury, the Court may grant ex parte ad interim injunctive relief

The **Delhi High Court** in the case of **Gujarat Cooperative Milk Marketing Federation vs RK Singh Rajput [CS(COMM) 636/2026]** dated **May 29, 2026**, has emphasised that online publications are capable of causing continuing reputational and commercial injury to the user of a well-known trademark, and therefore, restrained Defendants and all persons acting on their behalf from uploading any videos or other publications disparaging the plaintiffs or the AMUL mark, and also directed Defendants to take down the URLs within 36 hours of receipt of the order and prohibited re-upload of identical content until further orders.

The Court held that where social media publications are prima facie false, disparaging and structured in a manner that harms the goodwill and reputation attached to a well-known trademark, and where such content has rapid and unrestricted digital reach capable of causing continuing commercial and reputational injury, the Court may grant ex parte ad interim injunctive relief. Accordingly, the Court treated the continuing publication and dissemination of such material as constituting imminent and irreparable harm, especially where reputational injury could not be adequately compensated in monetary terms.

The Court recorded that the impugned publications and posts on social media platforms were, prima facie, disparaging and appeared to demonstrate a deliberate attempt to sensitize public sentiments relating to cow meat in India. It noted that the content had far-reaching and global dissemination through social media and was causing harm to the formidable goodwill and reputation of the plaintiffs in respect of products sold under the well-known mark AMUL since 1958.

The Court also observed that, given the false, sensational, provocative and inflammatory nature of the content, there was a real likelihood of further amplification of the misinformation if the material remained accessible in the public domain. Further, the Court accepted the plaintiffs' contention that continued accessibility and circulation of the impugned material posed an imminent and continuing threat to their goodwill, reputation and commercial interests, and observed that once reputation is lost, monetary compensation may not retrieve the damage. On that basis, the Court found that the plaintiffs had made out a prima facie case for grant of ex parte ad interim injunction, that the balance of convenience lay in their favour, and that irreparable harm would follow if interim protection were denied.