

Delhi High Court Refuses Interim Relief in Alkem's "A TO Z" Trademark Dispute

In *Alkem Laboratories Limited v. Prevego Healthcare and Research Pvt. Ltd.* (2026:DHC:411), the Delhi High Court declined to grant an interim injunction restraining the defendant from using "MULTIVEIN AZ", rejecting Alkem's claim that its "A TO Z" trademarks conferred exclusive rights over the letters A and Z.

Alkem contended that it had used A TO Z since 1998 for its nutraceutical products and had built significant goodwill in the mark. It argued that the defendant's use of AZ for similar products was deceptively similar and likely to cause consumer confusion.

The Court held that the plaintiff could not be permitted to monopolise the letters "A" and "Z", which are common elements of the English alphabet. It noted that individual letters cannot be appropriated as trademarks, particularly when the plaintiff had itself acknowledged before the Trade Marks Registry that its device mark was stylised, with protection limited to its distinctive intertwined and conjoined visual representation. The Court clarified that registration of a device mark protects only the mark in its registered form and does not extend to generic expressions or individual alphabet letters.

The Court further observed that "A TO Z" is descriptive and generic in the context of multivitamin products, conveying completeness



rather than source. Relying on Section 17 of the Trade Marks Act, it reiterated that where a trademark comprises multiple elements, exclusivity is afforded only to the mark taken as a whole. In the absence of exclusive rights over A and Z, the Court found no deceptive similarity between the plaintiff's marks and the impugned mark.

The Court also criticised Alkem for failing to disclose earlier trademark applications for "**A to Z**" in Class 5 that had been withdrawn, abandoned, or opposed. This material non-disclosure, the Court held, disentitled the plaintiff from seeking equitable relief. Accordingly, the application for interim injunction was therefore refused.

This decision underscores that trademark protection does not extend to generic or descriptive expressions unless independent distinctiveness is clearly established. Courts remain cautious against granting monopolies over common linguistic elements.



DISCLAIMER: The material contained in this publication is solely for information and general guidance and not for advertising or soliciting. The information provided does not constitute professional advice that may be required before acting on any matter. While every care has been taken in the preparation of this publication to ensure its accuracy, Vaish Associates Advocates neither assumes responsibility for any errors, which despite all precautions, may be found herein nor accepts any liability, and disclaims all responsibility, for any kind of loss or damage arising on account of anyone acting/ refraining to act by placing reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

©2026, India. All Rights reserved with Vaish Associates Advocates

OUR OFFICES

DELHI

1st, 9th & 11th Floor,
Mohan Dev Building,
13, Tolstoy Marg,
New Delhi - 110001, India,

TEL: +91 11 42492525,
delhi@vaishlaw.com

MUMBAI

106, Peninsula Centre,
Dr. S. S. Rao Road, Parel,
Mumbai - 400012, India,

TEL: +91 22 42134101,
mumbai@vaishlaw.com

BENGALURU

Bhive Premium
Ramanashree (MG Road) No. 2/1,
Brunton Road, Off MG Road
Opposite Old Passport Office
Bengaluru - 560001, India

TEL: +91 80409 03588/ 89
bangalore@vaishlaw.com



CORPORATE, TAX AND BUSINESS ADVISORY LAW FIRM