$~51

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

% *Date of Decision: 21st January, 2026*

\+ CS(COMM) 252/2019 & I.A. 7074/2019

BENNETT, COLEMAN & COMPANY LIMITED & ANR. .....Plaintiffs

Through: Ms. Mamta R. Jha, Mr. Akhil Saxena and Ms. Palak Batra, Advocates.

versus

SERAPHIC DIVINE BEAUTY PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS. .....Defendants

Through: Defendants are *ex parte*.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

JUDGEMENT

JYOTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. This suit is filed by the Plaintiffs seeking a decree of permanent injunction restraining Defendants No.1 and 2 and all others acting on their behalf from organizing the impugned event/beauty pageant DIVINE MISS INDIA comprising of Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA with mere addition of the prefix DIVINE and/or operating/owning the website www.divinemissindia.com, amongst other reliefs.

2. Plaintiff No.1 was incorporated on 29.11.1913 and has been since then publishing newspapers, magazines and periodicals. Plaintiff No.2 was incorporated on 16.09.2003 as a result of strategic alliance with Worldwide Channels Investments Limited and Plaintiff No.1 for publishing magazines and newspapers in India and has been publishing a wide range of

publications such as Top Gear, Femina (Hindi). In August, 2011 Plaintiff No.1 acquired remaining 50% shares of Plaintiff No.2 and the latter became a fully owned subsidiary of Plaintiff No.1.

3. As stated in the plaint, Plaintiffs belong to Times Group, which has been involved in varieties of businesses such as media and entertainment including radio broadcast, event management, outdoor advertising, television broadcast, publication of newspapers and magazines, internet services etc. Times Group under the trademark TIMES started 180 years ago with the business of publishing newspapers, journals and books and as averred, on the date of filing the suit it had more than 45 dailies and periodicals in 06 languages with 150 editions and over 7000 employees and a combined annual turnover in excess of USD 700 million.

4. It is stated that Plaintiffs are also proprietors of several magazines under various brands covering everything from fashion to lifestyle, current trends to beauty pageants and integrated marketing, some of which are Femina, Filmfare, Home Trends. Through their tremendous goodwill and reputation, Plaintiffs have also forayed into the business of hosting events which are business as well as entertainment related, ranging from summits, conferences to fashion shows and beauty pageants. Times Group organizes and hosts the Filmfare Awards, the Economic Times Awards, to name a few and one of the most iconic events organized by the Plaintiffs is Miss India Pageant, winners of which represent India at the International beauty pageant 'Miss World'.

5. Plaintiff No.1 adopted the trademark MISS INDIA and has been using the same since 01.01.1964. Plaintiffs have obtained multiple trademark registrations in various classes for the trademark MISS INDIA and its

formative trademarks, which are as follows:-

TRADE MARK REGISTRATION DETAILS

Trade mark	Registration No.	Dated	Class	Goods/services covered
MISS INDIA	2533602	18.05.2013	9	pre-recorded or blank audio & video cassettes, discs, tapes & records; video magazines, films, cinema-slides, cinematographic films, pictures, video films & documentaries; television chat shows, television serials & advertisement films (recorded); recorded events, programmes, music, computer-aided, digital or electronic graphics, animation, multi-media applications & audio or video contents (either recorded or playable on electronic devices or downloadable via internet or wired or wireless devices); data communication & processing apparatus & instruments.
FEMINA	658152	03.09.1995	16	newspaper, magazines

MISS INDIA				and periodical etc.
FEMINA MISS INDIA	2450287	27.12.2012	16	newspapers, periodicals, magazines, books & publications, news bulletins; printed matters, printed columns & articles, supplements to newspapers; printed screen-plays, scripts; posters, clipboards, advertisement frames, advertisement & publicity literature; letter heads, calendars & diaries; stationery and other office requisites other than furniture; commemorative stamp sheets, printed awards & certificates; pictures; graphic reproduction cards of all types & description; souvenir books; albums; writing instruments including pens and pencils.
MISS INDIA	2533603	18.05.2013	16	newspapers, periodicals, magazines, books & publications, news bulletins; printed matters, printed columns & articles, supplements to newspapers; printed screen-plays, scripts; posters, clipboards, advertisement frames, advertisement & publicity literature; letter heads, calendars & diaries; stationery and other office

				requisites other than furniture; commemorative stamp sheets, printed awards & certificates; pictures; graphic reproduction cards of all types & description; souvenir books; albums; writing instruments including pens and pencils.
MISS INDIA	2533631	18.05.2013	35	advertising, on-line advertising on various communication medias; organization of exhibitions & trade fairs for advertising purposes; promoting the goods & services of others by arranging for sponsors to affiliate their goods & services; promoting the goods & services of others through the distribution of discount cards; distribution of tickets, souvenirs & merchandise; demonstration of goods; distribution of samples for advertisement purpose
MISS INDIA ORGANIZATION 	2533635	18.05.2013	35	advertising, on-line advertising on various communication medias; organization of exhibitions & trade fairs for advertising purposes; promoting the goods & services of others by arranging for sponsors to affiliate their goods & services

				with a film awards program, film awards nomination, beauty contests, music & other audio visual entertainment programs & competitions; promoting the goods & services of others through the distribution of discount card; distribution of tickets, souvenirs & merchandise; demonstration of goods; distribution of samples for advertisement purpose
MISS INDIA	2533609	18.05.2013	38	television & radio broadcasting, cable television broadcasting; news agencies; providing telecommunications & user access to a global computer network & services; telecommunications & communication by computer terminals; cellular telephone services; optic fiber networks; telegrams & telephone; electronic & facsimile transmission; transmission of messages & images; wire service.
FEMINA MISS INDIA (DEVICE)	2450290	27.12.2012	41	arranging and conducting of beauty contests & beauty contests programme; providing recognition

				by way of awards & incentives upon beauty contest winners and people from different walks of life including fashion industry, modeling, film, entertainment, drama, stage shows, television & radio, music, theatre arts, journalism, social services & games; radio & television entertainment; conducting entertainment & cultural programs & competitions; TV, cinema & theatre facilities; orchestra services; organization of live performances & shows; education.
FEMINA MISS INDIA TV	2496362	15.03.2013	41	arranging and conducting of beauty contests & beauty contests programme; providing recognition by way of awards & incentives upon beauty contest winners and people from different walks of life including fashion industry, modeling, film, entertainment, drama, stage shows, television & radio, music, theatre arts, journalism, social services & games; radio & television entertainment; conducting entertainment &

				cultural programs & competitions; t.v, cinema & theatre facilities; orchestra services; organization of live performances & shows; education.

6. The Registrations are stated to be valid and subsisting and renewed from time to time. Earlier, some of the registrations of the trademark 'FEMINA MISS INDIA' were granted subject to disclaimers, however, later registration of trademark MISS INDIA was granted without any limitation since the trademark had acquired distinctiveness, owing to long, continuous and extensive use since 1964. Plaintiffs have invested considerable amount of time, efforts and financial resources in building reputation under the mark MISS INDIA, which is evident from the annual revenue figures and annual promotional expenses from 2001 to 2019 as follows:-

Financial Year	Annual Revenues (INR Lac)	Annual Promotional Expenses (INR Lac)
2001-2002	945	188
2002-2003	865	297
2003-2004	158	105
2004-2005	1,094	177
2005-2006	781	590
2006-2007	194	12
2007-2008	1,838	196
2008-2009	1,849	195
2009-2010	855	179
2010-2011	1,872	174
2011-2012	2,274	1,917
2012-2013	2,121	1,449
2013-2014	1,219	1,174
2014-2015	2,192	2,782
2015-2016	1,403	1,910
2016-2017	2,382	2,316
2017- 2018	1, 537	2,632
2018-2019	2,401	2,933

7. It is stated that Plaintiffs have diligently protected their intellectual

property rights against infringers and have been given favourable orders in several suits and oppositions. Courts have from time to time recognized and affirmed the substantial goodwill and reputation associated with the Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA and its formatives. Details of the various Court orders are illustratively provided in paragraph 23 of the plaint as follows:-

Sl. No.	Legal actions taken against Third Party for use of the Complainants' trade mark MISS INDIA	Infringing Mark	Status
1.	CS. (Comm.) No. 364/2016 titled Bennett, Coleman, and Co. Ltd. & Anr. vs. Square Communications Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi	MISS INDIA WORLDWIDE (in relation to beauty pageant under the above said mark)	The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 04.09.2015 was pleased to injunct the Defendants from using the trade mark MISS INDIA as part of their event and from giving any impression that the Defendants have any connection with the Plaintiffs. The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 11.12.2017 in view of the interim arrangement between the parties, clarified that the terms "MISS" and "INDIA" may be used by the Defendants in their title with sufficiently distinguishing word(s) inserted between the words "MISS" and "INDIA" and not in conjunction for their events in India. The matter was subsequently decreed in favor of the Plaintiffs vide order dated 31.01.2018 in terms of the interim arrangement.
2.	CS. (Comm.) No. 616/2018 titled Bennett,	MISS INDIA MURDERS	The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 20.02.2018

	Coleman, and Co. Ltd. & Anr. vs. Ms. Gauri Sinh & Anr. before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi	(for using the trade mark MISS INDIA in the title of the book)	was pleased to grant ad interim injunction against the Defendants restraining them from advertising and selling the book titled "MISS INDIA MURDERS". The suit is still pending.
3.	Commercial Suit (I.P.) (L). No. 1009 of 2018 titled Bennett, Coleman, and Co. Ltd. & Anr. vs. Ms. Sathya Saran & Anr. before Hon'ble High Court of Bombay	HOW TO LOOK LIKE MISS INDIA (for using the trade mark MISS INDIA in the title of the book)	The suit stand decreed vide order dated 18.07.2018 in terms of the consent terms filed by the parties wherein the Defendants, amongst other undertakings, acknowledged the rights of the Plaintiffs in the trade mark MISS INDIA and its formative marks and undertook not to infringe their rights in the said trade marks in future.
4.	CS. (Comm.) No. 1045/2018 titled Bennett, Coleman, and Co. Ltd. & Anr. vs. Mr. Amit Kumar Modi & Ors. before Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.	MISS & Mrs. INDIA (in relation to beauty pageant under the above said mark)	The Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 30.07.2018 was pleased to grant an interim injunction order against the Defendants restraining them from using the trade mark MISS INDIA or MISS formative marks. The Hon'ble Court vide the said order observed the following: "The Plaintiff is a

			proprietor of the registered trade mark MISS INDIA. The Plaintiff conceived the said trade mark as back as in the year 1964....The Plaintiffs have been using the trade mark MISS INDIA continuously and extensively since its inception and have acquired tremendous good-will and reputation." The suit vide order dated 17.09.2018 was subsequently decreed in terms of the settlement terms filed by the parties and in terms of the prayers of the plaint in favor of the Plaintiffs
5.	Bennett, Coleman & company Limited & Anr. vs. Mr. Hubert Louis & Ors. CS (COMM) 618 of 2019	Domain name-www.missindia.com	The Hon'ble High court of Delhi was pleased to pass an ex-parte injunction in favor of the Plaintiffs vide its order dated 21.02.2018 whereby the Defendants' were restrained from using the domain name www.missindia.com .Further, the Hon'ble Court was pleased to pass ex-parte decree in favor of the Plaintiffs' vide order dated 13.03.2018 and directed the Registrar of domain name Enom Inc.

	UDRP complaint Bennett, Coleman & company Limited & Anr. vs. Mr. Hubert Louis Case No. D2019-0221	Domain name-www.missindia.com	to transfer the impugned domain name. Despite specific order for transfer of the impugned domain name www.missindia.com, the Registrar of domain name, Enom Inc. situated in USA did not comply with the order of the Hon'ble Court and sought domestication of the Judgment. Plaintiffs aggrieved filed WIPO complaint against the Registrant and sought transfer of the domain name. The Administrative panel decided in favour of the Complainants (Plaintiff herein) and directed the Registrar of domain name to transfer the domain name www.missindia.com to the Complainants (Plaintiffs herein) vide its decision dated 22.03.2019. The said domain name stand transferred in favor of the complainants as of today.

8. As per the Plaintiffs, cause of action for instituting the present suit arose in second week of May, 2019 when Plaintiffs came across Defendants No.1 and 2's Facebook page https://www.facebook.com/crownmissindia/

where Defendants No.1 and 2 were promoting/advertising the impugned DIVINE MISS INDIA beauty pageant or event. The Facebook page provided the link for the said Defendants' website www.divinemissindia.com, perusal of which revealed that Defendants No.1 and 2 were providing information of the upcoming beauty pageant and inviting applications from candidates from all places including Delhi. Plaintiffs also came across Defendants No.1 and 2's pending trademark application for DIVINE MISS INDIA. This prompted the Plaintiffs to file the present suit and vide order dated 14.05.2019, Court granted *ex parte* ad interim injunction, restraining Defendants No.1 and 2 from organizing any event/beauty pageant using the trademark DIVINE MISS INDIA or any other mark identical or deceptively similar to Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA. Court also directed Defendants No.1 and 2 to delete the domain name www.divinemissindia.com within one week from the date of the order and issued summons to them.

9. Defendants No.1 and 2 were served but failed to file the written statements and vide order dated 20.12.2019 their right to file written statements was closed by the learned Registrar, who also took note of their non-appearance on the said date despite repeated calls as also their non-appearance on the earlier date. On 08.01.2020 Defendants No.1 and 2 were proceeded *ex parte.* Defendant No.3/GoDaddy LLC and Defendant No.4/GoDaddy India Domains & Hosting Services Pvt. Ltd. were deleted from the array of parties. Later, Defendant No.2 filed I.A. No.3328/2022 under Order 9 CPC for setting aside the *ex parte* order, which was dismissed on 18.05.2022. There was no challenge to this order. Since Defendants No.1 and 2 were proceeded *ex parte,* Plaintiffs filed *ex parte* evidence by way of affidavit of Mr. Kumar Laxmikant, Authorized Signatory of the Plaintiffs.

The witness proved the averments in the plaint and exhibited documents as Ex.PW1/1 to Ex.PW1/22.

10. Learned counsel for the Plaintiffs submits that by virtue of registrations in the trademark MISS INDIA and its formatives, Plaintiffs have acquired statutory rights in the trademarks and hence, by virtue of provisions of Section 28 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 (1999 Act), they have the exclusive right to use the trademarks and restrain third parties from infringing them. The goodwill and reputation earned by the Plaintiffs under the trademarks is unparalleled as is evident from the revenue and promotional figures given in the plaint. Through several Court orders, Courts have protected the statutory and common law rights of the Plaintiffs and restrained third parties from using the mark MISS INDIA.

11. It is stated that the impugned marks DIVINE MISS INDIA , are structurally, phonetically, visually and conceptually similar to Plaintiffs' registered trademark MISS INDIA and  and mere addition of the prefix 'DIVINE' is insufficient to distinguish the rival marks. The test to be applied in determining the deceptive similarity is that of a purchaser with average intelligence and imperfect recollection, who undoubtedly will confuse the impugned marks and will believe that the impugned pageant is another variation of Plaintiffs' brand. Reliance is placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Kaviraj Pandit Durga Dutt Sharma v. Navaratna Pharmaceuticals Laboratories, 1964 SCC OnLine SC 14; Amritdhara Pharmacy v. Satya Deo Gupta, 1962 SCC OnLine SC 13; Ruston & Hornsby Ltd. v. Zamindara***

Engineering Co., (1969) 2 SCC 727; and ***Parle Products (P) Ltd. v. J.P. and Co., Mysore, (1972) 1 SCC 618,*** to further this plea.

12. It is further argued that the adoption and use of nearly identical mark/domain name by Defendants No.1 and 2 for identical services would inevitably cause confusion and deception amongst the members of the public as also injury to the enviable brand equity, goodwill and reputation enjoyed by trademark MISS INDIA. It is clear that Defendant No.2 wanted to encash on the goodwill and reputation of the Plaintiffs and misrepresent to the public that their pageant has an association with the Plaintiffs and this amounts to passing off. It is further urged that the instant case is a classic case of initial interest confusion, which is a recognized concept, and in this context, reliance is placed on the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in ***Under Armour Inc v. Anish Agarwal and Another, 2025 SCC OnLine Del 3784.*** In this backdrop, learned counsel for the Plaintiffs prays for a decree of injunction against Defendants No.1 and 2, restraining them permanently from infringing the trademark MISS INDIA and its formatives and/or from passing off and also seeks costs of the proceedings while giving up other reliefs, on instructions.

13. Heard learned counsel for the Plaintiffs and examined the submissions made as also the *ex parte* evidence on record.

14. As noted above, Defendants No.1 and 2 were proceeded *ex parte* and the application filed by Defendant No.2 for setting aside the *ex parte* order was dismissed, but this order was not challenged. This suit is predicated on statutory rights emanating from registrations in the mark MISS INDIA and its formatives as also common law rights owing to formidable goodwill and reputation garnered by the Plaintiffs by use of the mark MISS INDIA from 01.01.1964. Mr. Kumar Laxmikant, Authorized Signatory has filed his

evidence affidavit and proved Board Resolution dated 15.11.2021 as Ex.PW1/1 and Board Resolution dated 22.08.2018 as Ex.PW1/2. Articles/ Advertisements published in newspapers and magazines pertaining to MISS INDIA pageant since 1964 were proved as Ex.PW1/3 (colly.) and articles of newspapers/dailies/publications providing media coverage to MISS INDIA beauty pageants were exhibited as Ex.PW1/4 (colly.) along with news articles of third party international newspapers etc. as Ex.PW1/5 (colly.). Photographs of Miss India pageant winners from 1965 to 2018 were proved as Ex.PW1/6 (colly.) and internet printouts of Plaintiffs' websites showing Delhi as venue are Ex.PW1/7 (colly.). Copies of franchise/license agreements between Plaintiff No.1 and international trade organizations holding international beauty pageants were proved as Ex.PW1/8 and sponsorship agreements were proved as Ex.PW1/9. Ex.PW1/10 to Ex.PW1/12 are printouts of Google search results, promotional material and Plaintiffs' websites/Whois details, respectively.

15. Plaintiffs' witness has proved the trademarks registrations certificates along with their online status and trademark journals for word mark MISS INDIA as Ex.PW1/13. Orders of the Court restraining third parties from using the mark MISS INDIA were exhibited as Ex.PW1/14. Printout of MCA details of Defendant No.1 was exhibited as Ex.PW1/15 while screenshots and printouts from Defendants No.1 and 2's website www.divinemissindia.com were exhibited as Ex.PW1/16. Relevant screenshots of Defendants No.1 and 2's Facebook page as well as from their website showing the manner of use of Plaintiffs' mark were exhibited as Ex.PW1/18. Screenshot and internet printout of online application form of impugned pageants on Defendants No.1 and 2's website were exhibited as Ex.PW1/19 and screenshots from impugned website showing ongoing

auditions are Ex.PW1/20. Significantly, the witness also proved the online status of trademark application No.4121087 along with refusal order passed by the Registrar of Trade Marks and copies of notices of oppositions as filed in trademark application Nos.4121089, 4121090 and 4121091 along with online status was exhibited as Ex.PW1/21. Ex.PW1/22 are the internet printouts of Form TM-As along with its online status and examination reports for impugned trademarks bearing Nos.4121086, 4121088, 4116264, 4121087, 4121089, 4121090 and 412109.

16. A comparative analysis of the rival marks shows that Defendants No.1 and 2's impugned trademarks are phonetically, structurally, visually and conceptually similar to Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA and its formative marks. As rightly flagged by learned counsel, addition of prefix DIVINE to MISS INDIA is insufficient to distinguish the rival marks. The test to determine deceptive similarity is one of an unwary purchaser with average intelligence and imperfect recollection. With the deceptive similarity in the rival marks and the services being identical i.e. organization and promotion of beauty pageants, there is no doubt that members of the public will be confused and deceived into believing that the impugned pageant under the impugned marks has an association with the Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA along with its formative marks are duly registered and therefore, Plaintiffs have acquired a statutory right to use the mark MISS INDIA with its formatives exclusively as also to restrain third parties from infringing them. Several Court orders have been placed on record and proved by the Plaintiffs wherein Courts have come to their aid and protected the registered trademark MISS INDIA. Defendants No.1 and 2 have chosen to remain away from the proceedings and not contest the same.

17. Defendants No.1 and 2 attempted to seek registrations in the impugned marks but either the registrations were refused or the applications were abandoned, which is evident from the following table:-

Status of Trade Mark Applications of the Defendant

S. No.	Trade Mark	Registration No. & Date of application	Class	Status
1.		4121086 18.03.2019	Class 35	Refused Order-01.09.2022
2.	DIVINE MISS INDIA	4121088 18.03.2019	Class 35	Abandoned Order- 30.01.2024
3.		4116264 13.03.2019	Class 41	Abandoned Order-18.03.2024
4.		4121087 18.03.2019	Class 41	Refused Order: 03.11.2021
5.	DIVINE MISS INDIA	4121089 18.03.2019	Class 41	Abandoned Order-16.11.2022
6.	DIVINE MISS INDIA	4121090 18.03.2019	Class 43	Abandoned Order-16.11.2022
7.	DIVINE MISS INDIA	4121091 18.03.2019	Class 44	Abandoned Order-16.11.2022

18. A bare perusal of the rival marks shows that confusion amongst the members of public is inevitable. Even if one presumes that the members of public who watch beauty pageants are an informed audience, as rightly submitted by Ms. Jha, this is a text book case of initial interest confusion. Anyone who would come across the impugned marks DIVINE MISS INDIA/  after having initially come across the marks of the Plaintiffs MISS INDIA and  in respect of a beauty pageant,

would be placed in a state of wonderment as to whether the mark is the same as the one he had seen earlier or whether the mark before him bears an association with the mark he had earlier seen. Dealing with initial interest confusion, this Court in ***Under Armour, Inc. v. Aditya Birla Fashion & Retail Ltd, 2023 SCC OnLine Del 2269,*** held that if a feeling of association arises when the customer initially views the Defendant's marks, having seen Plaintiff's some time earlier, that feeling by itself, suffices to make out a case of infringement. The initial impresion is what, fundamentally, matters. Even the Division Bench in ***Under Armour (supra),*** observed that if a customer looking at the impugned marks associates the same with the Appellant's marks even though for a brief period, Appellant's trademarks would be infringed on a plain reading of Section 29(1) and (2) of the 1999 Act. The duration of confusion in the mind of the customer is not material. The fact that the customer is confused, even if momentarily, will be enough to establish infringement of trademark. The fact that he may on closer examination of products and enquiries find that impugned trademarks are not associated with Appellant's trademarks would not take away from the fact that the impugned trademarks bear a similarity with the Appellant's trademark, which led to the confusion. For ease of reference, a comparative of the rival marks in the instant case is as follows, which demonstrates that initial interest confusion will arise in the mind of an unwary customer :-

Plaintiff's trade mark	Defendant No. 2's trade mark
MISS INDIA	**DIVINE MISS INDIA**
	

19. Plaintiffs' goodwill and reputation is evident from the continuous, excessive and uninterrupted use of the trademark MISS INDIA since 1964;

revenues earned, promotional expenditure and Court orders. Clearly, Defendants No.1 and 2 have dishonestly adopted Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA in order to ride on the formidable goodwill and reputation of the Plaintiffs, built over the years. The intent in hosting a pageant under the impugned marks was to show an association with the Plaintiffs and confuse the members of public, which amounts to passing off.

20. Accordingly, it is held that Defendants No.1 and 2 have not only infringed Plaintiffs' trademark MISS INDIA and its formative marks but also attempted to pass off their pageant as one associated with the Plaintiffs and being one of their variations, thereby violating Plaintiffs' statutory and common law rights. In light of this, the suit is decreed in terms of prayers (a) and (b) of paragraph 46 of the plaint in favour of the Plaintiffs and against Defendants No.1 and 2.

21. The only other relief pressed by the Plaintiffs is for costs of the proceedings. Plaintiffs are held entitled to the actual costs of the proceedings, recoverable jointly from Defendants No.1 and 2 in terms of Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 ('2018 Rules') read with Delhi High Court Intellectual Property Division Rules, 2022. Plaintiffs have filed their bill of costs in terms of Rule 5 of Chapter XXIII of 2018 Rules. List the matter before the Taxing Officer on 27.02.2026 for computation of costs.

22. Registry is directed to draw up the decree sheet.

23. Suit is disposed of along with the pending application.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JANUARY 21, 2026/YA