FROM MARKS OF ORIGIN TO SYMBOLS OF POWER: THE EXHAUSTIVE EVOLUTION AND EXPANSION OF TRADEMARK LAW

Harshith Sai Boddu, London School of Economics and Political Science

Introduction and Traces of Evolution

Intellectual property (IP) and intellectual property rights (IPR) are quintessential examples of intangible assets that possess the profound ability to influence global economic trends, both presently and in the future. The knowledge-driven global economy of today is fundamentally what drives the essential assistance offered by intellectual property. By creating a legally enforceable framework of exclusive rights, IP systems facilitate the commercialisation of innovation, incentivise corporate investment, and regulate the complex dynamics of market competition. However, there remains a persistent layer of scepticism and philosophical disagreement surrounding intellectual property rights (IPR), particularly with regard to trademark law, which is inextricably linked to the often-contentious realm of ownership conflicts, consumer psychology, and market monopolies.[1]

What distinguishes this specific domain from the rest of the intellectual property spectrum—such as patents or copyrights, which are primarily concerned with fostering novel inventions or creative expressions—is its historical development. The evolution of trademark law has been profoundly tainted and shaped by the need to balance commercial innovation with market incentives and consumer protection. Trademarks, which function as distinctive signs used to differentiate identical or similar products and services offered by different companies or providers, have flourished in popularity and use from the period of the Roman Empire all the way up to the present day. Trademark law aims to protect the core meaning and commercial magnetism of a mark, preventing unauthorised uses that confuse consumers or, in the case of famous marks, interfere with consumers' mental link between the mark and the underlying goods. Consumer confusion is the cornerstone and key to various legal principles in trademark law, which primarily facilitates the dissemination of accurate market information.[2]

To fully comprehend the contemporary legal architecture governing brand protection, one must

first trace its origins. Trademarks have existed for millennia, serving initially as rudimentary tools of property assertion. Evidence of using markings to distinguish ownership, either as the property owner and/or its manufacturer, dates back to ancient times.[3] Prehistoric Lascaux cave paintings in southern France, which date back approximately 15,000 years, depict bison and horses bearing specific symbols. Scholars and historians interpret these markings as primitive indicators of tribal ownership over livestock, deployed primarily to deter theft in an era preceding literate societies.[4] As human societies transitioned from the collective tribal ownership of the hunter-gatherer era to the individual family proprietorships of the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, selective breeding transformed livestock into a primary measure of human wealth. To incentivise the husbandry of these herds, Neolithic peoples instituted informal property rights by physically branding their cattle—a practice that firmly embedded the concept of the 'mark' into human economic behaviour.[5]

As agrarian communities evolved into complex ancient civilisations, the function of the mark expanded correspondingly. Ancient civilisations like China, Egypt, Greece, India, and Rome used marks extensively to denote origin, guarantee quality, and provide an administrative mechanism to handle complaints.[6] In ancient Egypt, approximately 6,000 years ago, stonecutters and quarry workers inscribed masonry with specific quarry marks and hieroglyphs. These signs served a dual purpose: they named the geographical source of the stone and identified the specific labourer who carried out the work, which was essential for claiming wages and ensuring structural accountability. The practice became increasingly sophisticated as commerce expanded over long-distance routes. In the tomb of Pharaoh Tutankhamun (reigning circa 1336–1327 BCE), archaeologists discovered wine amphorae marked with intricate seals indicating the vintage and the vintner. Similarly, in the ancient Roman Empire, craftsmen routinely left unique stamps on a vast array of manufactured goods, including pottery, cutlery, vases, tombstones, and even plumbing fixtures. A notable historical example is the logo utilised by Marcus Sestius, an ancient Roman wine merchant whose marked goods have been excavated across the Mediterranean basin. In these contexts, the mark indicated exactly whom to hold responsible if a product failed, laying the psychological groundwork for modern brand accountability.[7]

The purpose of marks changed rapidly in the period between the fall of the Roman Empire and the Renaissance. During the Middle Ages, the marking of goods transitioned from an optional practice of establishing reputation to a compulsory regulatory mechanism enforced by powerful

European trade guilds.[8] These guilds required their members to affix distinct 'production marks' to their wares. Some medieval trade guild marks—such as the specific hallmarks utilised to certify gold and silver purity—remain in continuous use today, even though the original guilds that established them are long gone. These early production marks served to maintain the monopolies of the guilds, ensure adherence to strict quality standards, and protect consumers from inferior craftsmanship.[9]

Over time, these compulsory guild practices evolved into today's trademark registration and protection system. The earliest codified national trademark legislation was England's 1266 Bakers' Marking Law.[10] Enacted by the Parliament under the reign of King Henry III, this statute required all bakers to place a distinctive stamp or pinprick on the loaves of bread they sold. The law was promulgated to combat widespread economic deception, as bakers were frequently suspected of defrauding consumers by selling underweight loaves while charging standard prices. This was subsequently followed in 1363 by a law making the use of assay and makers' marks mandatory for English silversmiths.

From the 13th to the 16th centuries, 'Merchants' Marks' began to emerge alongside guild marks. Unlike guild marks, which were collective and heavily regulated, merchants' marks were individualised symbols used by traders to identify their specific cargo and bales during long-distance maritime transit. These marks served as personal trader guarantees of expected quality, rendering them the true precursors to modern commercial trademarks. As the inherent property value of these marks became apparent, the legal system began to recognise the necessity of protecting them from piracy. In 1353, English statutes enabled merchants who had fallen victim to maritime piracy to prove the ownership of recovered goods through their specific merchants' marks. The formal legal transition connecting these medieval marks to modern trademark infringement jurisprudence is universally attributed to the landmark 1618 English common law case of *Southern v How*.[11] In this case, a manufacturer of high-quality apparel sued a competitor who had deceitfully applied the plaintiff's distinctive mark to lower-quality clothing to exploit the plaintiff's established reputation, marking the first recorded judicial acknowledgement of trademark piracy.

Trademark Law and Policy Paradigm Shifts

Trademark law and policy have changed repeatedly, as historical limitations withered from a modest origin indication to a highly powerful consumer tool that dictates global commerce.

The jurisprudential origins of trademark law are rooted deeply in the common law tort of deceit. Trademark law's tortious deceit origin meant that initially, only actually deceived consumers possessed the legal standing to sue for fraud.

Originally, infringement claims required strict proof of "direct competition" and "literally false claims" regarding the mark owner's goods. Early jurisprudence dictated that if a defendant applied a plaintiff's mark to an entirely different class of goods, no legal remedy was available because the parties were not direct competitors in the same product market, and consumers were ostensibly not being diverted. This contrasts sharply with current expansive trademark law. The conceptual shift away from direct competition was solidified in cases such as the 1928 United States Second Circuit decision in *Yale Elec. v. Robertson*, where the court ruled that the junior use of the "Yale" trademark for flashlights and batteries unlawfully infringed upon the senior use of "Yale" for locks and keys.[12] The court recognised that a brand's reputation could be tarnished even if the goods were not in direct competition, paving the way for the modern legal standard that relies on the broader doctrine of "likelihood of consumer confusion" and protection against brand dilution.

Historically, to ensure consumer welfare and prevent the degradation of product quality, trademark law required trademarks to be assigned "with the goodwill" of the referenced business. Under 19th-century frameworks, such as the UK Trade Marks Registration Act of 1875, a mark could not be sold 'in gross' (independent of the physical business assets and manufacturing facilities). This rule was designed to deter assignees from purchasing a reputable mark only to affix it to vastly inferior products, thereby deceiving the public. However, as corporate structures grew increasingly complex, this rigid requirement became an impediment to commerce. The strict linkage between a mark and its physical manufacturing business was fundamentally altered by mid-20th-century legislation, notably Section 10 of the Lanham Act of 1946 in the United States.[13] This provision represented a clear break from tradition, recognising that a mark and its goodwill could be assigned separately from the broader business enterprise. Now, the strict physical assignment of goodwill is effectively optional when assigning marks in many jurisdictions, allowing for highly fluid trademark trading and licensing.

The trademark system's traditional geographical bounds shaped early commerce but were severely tested by the advent of the Internet, e-commerce, and domain names, requiring rapid

evolution. Domain names, pivotal in digital spaces, moved trademarks beyond mere technical Internet addresses into highly valuable e-commerce symbols of source and quality. With rapid 1990s Internet business growth but no established domain dispute standards, trademark owners faced an epidemic of 'cybersquatting'—the bad faith registration of famous trademarks as domain names by third parties seeking extortion. To resolve these conflicts, the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) adopted the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) on October 24, 1999.[14] The UDRP serves as a mandatory, expedited administrative proceeding for resolving disputes regarding the abusive registration of domain names within generic top-level domains (gTLDs). Under the UDRP, a trademark owner can force the transfer or cancellation of a domain name by proving three elements: the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to their trademark, the registrant has no legitimate rights, and the domain was registered and is being used in bad faith. Theories of territorial sovereignty severely constrain the concept of a single global legal framework for trademark law that seamlessly mirrors the unified global marketplace. Markets for goods and services now span the entire world. Unless major modifications are implemented for the internet architecture, such as imposing new domain names that block access for foreign individuals based on geographical IP targeting, the internet will persist without borders. The notions of direct competition, criteria for proving passing off, the doctrine of dilution, and the right of publicity have all evolved repeatedly to accommodate these shifts.

Furthermore, extending the elements that qualify for trademark protection to encompass any distinctive, non-functional product features has seen safeguards stretched to encompass non-traditional subject matter. Over time, trademark law has grown in both subject matter and reach, encroaching on areas traditionally governed by patents or industrial designs. One such region of intense debate on the expanding limits of trademark law presently is that of touch marks (textures), following the historical uproar over extending trademark security to sound marks, shapes, sights, tastes, and scent marks. The development of international trademark law has codified that such non-traditional marks can be shielded and registered under trademark law, strictly on the condition that the marks can be clearly and unambiguously defined and represented graphically or electronically.

The Indian Scenario: Historical Roots and Statutory Framework

India possesses an exceptionally robust and historically rich intellectual property ecosystem.

The history of trademark laws in India traces back to classical antiquity, specifically to Chanakya's (Kautilya's) *Arthashastra*, a foundational Sanskrit treatise on statecraft, economic policy, and military strategy compiled between the 2nd century BCE and the 3rd century CE.[15] The *Arthashastra* dealt extensively with the idea of protection of innovation and fair trade in the market.

While the *Arthashastra* is widely regarded as a manual for state administration, its extensive sections on *varta* (economic activity) reflect profound, systemic insights into the regulation of trade, margin of profit, consumer protection, and the prevention of market manipulation. Chanakya's economic philosophy fundamentally opposed the exploitation of consumers by unregulated merchants, whom he occasionally likened to thieves if left unchecked. The text established structured market systems and heavily regulated the activities of *shrenis* (specialised trade guilds). It mandated the appointment of a *panyadhyaksha* (market superintendent) to oversee vendor relations, pricing policies, and operational efficiency. Furthermore, the *Arthashastra* explicitly required traders to obtain official licenses before opening shops, thereby ensuring that only legitimate commodities were sold and that fraudulent merchants were eliminated from the marketplace. This ancient emphasis on injecting ethics into trade and balancing commercial profit with social responsibility closely mirrors the dual objectives of modern trademark law.

Despite this rich ancient history, formal, codified trademark legislation did not exist in India prior to the mid-20th century. During the British colonial period and the early stages of industrialisation, the burgeoning Indian textile industry—particularly the Bombay Mills Owners Association in 1877 and 1879—repeatedly petitioned for the creation of trademark registration laws akin to the English Trade Marks Registration Act of 1875.[16] Before this legislation, which aimed to address challenges in implementation, there was no specific trademark law in India.

In the absence of a dedicated trademark statute, issues related to infringement and passing off were handled by Section 54 of the Specific Relief Act, 1877.[17] Section 54 dealt with the granting of perpetual injunctions to prevent the breach of an obligation. Crucially, an explicit Explanation attached to Section 54 stated: *"For the purpose of this section a trademark is property"*. This legislative classification allowed courts to exercise discretion and grant perpetual injunctions against trademark infringers at par with any other form of property

trespass, provided that pecuniary compensation was deemed inadequate. Concurrently, trademark registration relied solely on the Indian Registration Act, 1908.[18] Under this Act, businesses sought to establish a formal record of their brands by filing declarations of ownership. While this provided a written record, it did not confer the positive, exclusive statutory rights associated with modern trademark registration, leaving brand owners vulnerable to heavy litigation costs. Additionally, the Indian Merchandise Marks Act, 1889, was utilised as a criminal-law-oriented tool to prevent the fraudulent marking of merchandise.

A formal legislation finally came about by the passage of the Indian Trademark Act in 1940, aligning with English Trademark Law.[19] To overcome persistent implementation difficulties and respond to the growing demand for enhanced trademark protection in an industrialising economy, the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act of 1958 eventually replaced the 1940 Act.[20] This new act focused on providing more robust safeguards for trademarks and sought to prevent the deceptive use of marks on goods, thereby facilitating research and protecting consumer welfare. This Act further aimed to simply the registration process.

The Doctrine of Distinctiveness

One of the fundamental principles governing trademarks globally, and explicitly mandated under Indian law, is the doctrine of distinctiveness. A trademark that cannot differentiate the goods or services of one entity from another lacks protection under the law. Safeguarding trademarks as intellectual property is often justified by their ability to distinguish one provider's offering from competitors'. Thus, the prior trademark owner's interests depend entirely on the mark's capacity to differentiate the goods or services of one party from another.

Trademark distinctiveness has two related economic objectives. First, it identifies a single source for the goods or services. This allows consumers to rely on recognising that source to guarantee quality. Second, by strictly denying monopoly protection to generic or merely descriptive terms, it ensures competitors can freely use those terms to describe their own goods or services. That is, distinctiveness enables traders to freely employ specific terminology about their offerings without fear of infringement litigation. The distinctiveness prerequisite effectively curbs firms' tendency to pick marks with source-identifying and descriptive aspects that could capture greater market share than source identification alone.

A trademark's distinctiveness benefits both businesses and customers. For companies, it

indicates their offerings' origin and serves as a repository for brand equity. For consumers, it signals the expected quality by confirming the reliable source. Essentially, distinctiveness conveys a trademark's core message about the labelled goods or services' source. Consequently, Indian trademark law mandates rejecting marks lacking distinctive character or source-differentiating capability for registration. Distinctiveness is a quality and fundamental trait of a trademark; it is the sine qua non that qualifies the mark for trademark status and protection.

Distinctiveness is not a binary concept but operates on a complex legal spectrum. This lexical taxonomy was most famously formalised in the landmark United States Second Circuit Court of Appeals decision, *Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v. Hunting World, Inc.*, 537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976).[21] In this case, Abercrombie & Fitch sued a competitor for infringing on its registered use of the word 'Safari' for apparel. In adjudicating the dispute, Judge Friendly established the classic spectrum of trademark distinctiveness, classifying marks into five descending categories:

Distinctiveness Category	**Legal Definition and Protection Status**	**Example Application**
1. Generic (Common terms)	Denotes a general class of items. Completely ineligible for trademark protection, as granting a monopoly would stifle language and competition.	"Apple" used for selling actual apples.
2. Descriptive terms	Immediately conveys a product's ingredients, quality, or characteristics. Not inherently distinctive. Protected only if they acquire "secondary meaning" through extensive use.	"Vision Center" for an eyecare clinic.
3. Suggestive terms	Requires imagination, thought, or perception to	"Netflix" for streaming, or "Airbus" for aviation.

	deduce the nature of the associated goods/services. Inherently distinctive; warrants registration without proving secondary meaning.	
4. Arbitrary terms	Existing dictionary words applied to goods in a manner entirely unrelated to their meaning. Inherently distinctive.	"Apple" applied to computers.
5. Fanciful terms	Invented or coined words with no dictionary meaning. Represent the pinnacle of trademark protection.	"Kodak" for photography.

A generic term denotes a general class of items. An apple is the generic name for that fruit, but apple applied to computers has acquired secondary meaning (functioning as an arbitrary mark) and merits aggressive protection. It is vital to note that even arbitrary or fanciful terms can become generic through extensive, unpoliced public use (genericide), thereby losing their protection. A descriptive term immediately conveys a product's ingredients, quality, or characteristics, and thus requires evidence that the public associates the term exclusively with the proprietor (secondary meaning). A suggestive term requires imagination, thought, or perception to deduce the nature of the associated goods or services. Suggestive marks warrant registration without proving secondary meaning.

Fanciful or arbitrary marks represent the pinnacle of trademark treatment since they are invented or coined, not merely descriptive. Registration applies to these marks without needing to establish secondary meaning. They are sometimes called "technical trademarks" in older jurisprudence. Fanciful and arbitrary marks have inherent trademark status for three critical reasons:

a) The public will inevitably see the term as a trademark rather than a descriptor.

b) One party claiming a non-descriptive term as a trademark does not prevent competitors from

describing their offerings.

c) First users and potential competitors need absolute certainty about a term's trademark status to avoid costly litigation.

As the historical Welds case established, once a trader adopts a fanciful mark, the public must strictly avoid that mark. Furthermore, Trademark law aims to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks for goods and services. Perhaps the law also intends to prevent the use of fraudulent marks on goods and services, bridging the gap between proprietary rights and public welfare.

Objectives of Trademark Law

Fundamentally, trademark law seeks to achieve two key objectives: protecting the individual interests of the trademark owner, and protecting the interests of consumers and society at large. Striking a delicate balance between these two conflicting interests is said to be the fundamental goal of modern trademark law. Let us examine these two important objectives of trademark law in more detail.

1. Protection of the Personal Interests of the Trademark Owner

The main goal of trademark law is to protect the personal interests of the trademark proprietor or user. This could also be called protecting and promoting the commercial interests of the trader. The protection of the individual interests of the trademark owner can be examined under the following three headings:

Defense of the Exclusive Rights of the Trademark Owner: Trademark law gives the trademark proprietor the exclusive right to use their trademark. The proprietor enjoys a monopoly over the use of the trademark by excluding everyone else from the relevant market space. The law also provides robust civil and criminal relief if this monopoly is infringed through trademark infringement of a registered mark or passing off of an unregistered mark. The remedies include perpetual injunctions, damages, and account of profits. For the statutory offence of falsification, the law prescribes severe penalties, including imprisonment and fines. Therefore, trademark law protects the individual interests of the proprietor by granting exclusive monopoly to the proprietor while prohibiting everyone else, as well as by providing remedies for breaches or violations of such monopoly. This is the primary objective of

trademark law.

Protection of the Proprietor's Right to Transfer: The law protects the individual commercial interests of the trademark proprietor like any other tangible property. The exclusive right over the trademark given to the proprietor by trademark law includes the right to assign or transfer it to another person for consideration. Instead of assigning, the proprietor may also license their rights to an interested party, generating royalty revenue. Thereby, trademark law confers not just the right of using the mark to the proprietor, but also the economic right to transfer the rights involved with or associated with the trademark.

Protection of the Goodwill and Reputation of the Trader and Business People: Trademarks used in business or trade become inextricably identified with the "goodwill" or "reputation" of the traders and business people connected to the "goods" and "services" associated with their trademarks. For example, the golden arches trademark and McDonald's trade name are instantly identifiable with the fast-food chain's worldwide reputation for consistency. Trademarks are carriers of the goodwill or reputation of the goods and the trader or manufacturer. Trademark law directly protects the trademark as soon as the vendible article is launched in the market. At the same time, it protects the goodwill and reputation represented by or carried through the trademark. The established legal principle is that nobody has the right to represent their goods as somebody else's goods, and sell them for their own parasitic benefit. Therefore, the main purpose of trademarks is to protect the individual interests of the trader by granting exclusive monopoly on the use of the trademark, recognising the proprietor's rights to transfer rights in the mark, and by protecting the goodwill and reputation of the goods and trader represented by the trademark.

2. Protecting the Interest of Society

Trademarks serve to identify the physical source of goods or services, which profoundly benefits society. Trademarks should truthfully indicate the origin of goods and services, and not be used falsely to manipulate purchasing decisions. Using a trademark in a false or misleading way to suggest an incorrect origin can lead to severe penalties under trademark law. In the landmark case of *Laxmikant V. Patel v Chetanbhat Shah & Anr.*, the Supreme Court of India ruled that businesses must operate honestly, and not mislead consumers into believing their goods or services belong to someone else or are associated with them.[22] These types of dishonest practices are considered unfair trade practices.

The purpose of trademark law is to prohibit unfair trade practices by penalising the improper use of trademarks or false claims about the origin of goods or services. The principles of honesty and fairness should be fundamental in business. When someone adopts or plans to adopt a trademark connected to their business or services that already belongs to someone else, it causes immediate market confusion and can divert customers and clients to them instead, thereby harming the original trademark owner and defrauding the consumer.

Jurisprudential Landmarks in Deceptive Similarity and Passing Off

The trademark indicates the quality of the goods and services, thereby serving the interests of society. As held in the critical Supreme Court case *Sumat Prasad Jain v Sheojanam Prasad Dead and State of Bihar*, AIR 1972 SC 2488, a trademark not only identifies with its owner but also the qualities of the associated goods and services.[23] In this case, the complainant manufactured a popular scent named "Basant Bahar." The appellant subsequently marketed an inferior scent using the exact same name to exploit the complainant's market popularity. The Supreme Court upheld the criminal conviction of the appellant, drawing a vital distinction between a 'property mark' (denoting ownership of movable property) and a 'trademark' (denoting manufacturing source or quality). Thus, trademark law guarantees quality and proper origin, protecting consumers from deception about goods or their sources. This serves consumer and public interest. Extending trademark protection to traders while guaranteeing consumer interest achieves two key objectives. The trademark bridges traders and consumers.

Deceptive trademarks are those that are likely to mislead or confuse the average consumer who has an imperfect memory. The test for infringement is one of overall similarity. Deception must be judged case-by-case. It is deceptive if a consumer vaguely remembers buying a similar product before with a similar name and is tricked into purchasing a substitute. The expressions "deceptively similar" and "nearly resembling each other" are used interchangeably in the Act to indicate that even if two marks are not perfectly identical, their deceptive resemblance in sound or appearance can lead consumers to wrongly assume they are commercially associated. This confusion stems from imperfect consumer recollection rather than intentional deception by the infringing party. The context shows that "similarity" must be likely to cause confusion, not just mere visual resemblance. So "deceptively similar" differs from "similar" only by specifying the likelihood of deceiving consumers, not the trademark owner's intent. To determine confusion likelihood, courts assess how average consumers would mentally react to

and associate the marks in normal trade circumstances.

There is a fundamental legal difference between confusion and deception. The infringing mark must closely resemble the registered mark enough to probably deceive or confuse. The infringer's intention is entirely irrelevant in a passing off action. Even an honest user can cause infringement if their mark is still likely to deceive or confuse. Deception means lying—making someone believe something false with intent. Confusion can happen blamelessly without lying if the consumer lacks the knowledge to distinguish between truthful marks or doesn't make the effort. So, confusion can happen blamelessly if the consumer associates truthful marks that resemble each other. Regarding deception and confusion, Lord Denning famously explained that deceiving someone involves telling a lie or making a false claim, causing them to believe something untrue. Causing confusion does not require lying, but may happen even if you tell the truth, if the person cannot distinguish it from other information known to them.

The Supreme Court of India held that to assess if a mark is deceptively similar, the broad, essential features should be considered, not side-by-side microscopic differences. It is enough if the overall impression makes a consumer likely to mistake one for the other. Ordinary buyers do not have a photographic memory. Each case must be judged on its own unique merits. The court's effort should not be to spot minute differences, but whether the overall impact conveys visual similarity. Mere ocular comparison is not decisive—phonetic sound resemblance matters equally. Real risk of confusion makes registration improper.

The application of this principle was forcefully demonstrated in the Supreme Court judgement *Laxmikant V. Patel v Chetanbhat Shah & Anr.* (2002) 3 SCC 65. The plaintiff operated a highly reputable photography business in Ahmedabad under the trade name "Muktajivan Colour Lab and Studio." The defendant subsequently attempted to open a competing business using the exact same name. The lower trial court had erroneously refused to grant an injunction on the grounds that the defendant's new business was located 4 to 5 kilometres away, assuming this physical distance negated the potential for consumer confusion. The Supreme Court swiftly overturned this, stating that in a modern urban environment, a geographic distance of 4 to 5 kilometres is irrelevant, as consumers will readily travel to obtain high-quality services associated with a trusted brand. Furthermore, the Court reiterated that an action for passing off lies wherever a defendant's name is calculated to deceive or cause confusion, and that the defendant's state of mind is immaterial. The Court granted an ad-interim injunction, cementing

the principle that commercial goodwill is property that must be fiercely protected from opportunistic dilution.

A registered trademark of repute or a well-known trademark is widely known to the relevant public, possessing immense reputation and goodwill. Use of such a mark on any goods or services, even entirely unrelated ones, would lead consumers to automatically assume a commercial connection with the owner. To prevent this brand dilution, well-known marks have special, overarching protection—owners can prevent others from registering similar marks across all 45 classes of goods and services.

Modernisation of the Indian Regime: The Trade Marks Act 1999 and Rules 2017

In 1999, the modern Trade Marks Act came as a comprehensive breakthrough to further provide for robust remedies and enforcement of rights, replacing the antiquated 1958 legislation.[24] Inclusion of service marks, enhanced penalties for infringements, recognition of well-known marks, and a comprehensive definition of several useful terms in the domain of Trademarks made this exhaustive legislation a widely used and TRIPS-compliant statute.

Furthermore, to combat systemic administrative delays and red tape, new rules implemented on March 06, 2017 expedited the process further, heavily facilitated by electronic communication facilities dealt with in the Rules. Sound marks also found formal protection and procedural clarity in this coming-of-age legislation and its updated rules. Another positive change was the drastic reduction in the number of administrative forms from 74 to 8, encompassing various trademark applications, including single-class and multi-class applications. These amendments collectively aim to streamline and modernise the trademark registration system in India.

Expedited Processing of Applications (Rule 34)

The rules introduced expedited processing of trademark applications under Rule 34, allowing applicants to request express registration by paying additional fees.[25] Prior to these rules, 'expedited examination' was a limited concept that only accelerated the first stage of the process (the issuance of an examination report). Rule 34 expanded this horizon, allowing for the expedition of the entire lifecycle of the application—meaning the file jumps the queue at the examination stage, during the hearing phase, and even during the final registration disposal.

Applicants can file online requests for this expedited processing via Form TM-M.

To incentivise entrepreneurship and brand protection among smaller entities, the government instituted a bifurcated fee structure:

Applicant Category	**Standard Online Filing Fee**	**Expedited Processing Fee (Rule 34)**
Individuals / Startups / MSMEs	₹4,500	₹20,000
Large Companies / Other Entities	₹9,000	₹40,000

It is critical to note that while the registry's internal processing is expedited, the statutory four-month public opposition period following publication in the Trade Marks Journal remains non-reducible, preserving the public's right to challenge the mark.

2. Technological Integration: Video Conferencing (Rule 115)

Moreover, Rule 115 explicitly permits official hearings to be conducted through video conferencing or any other audio-visual communication.[26] This administrative modernisation contributes to vastly increased efficiency in the dispute resolution process, alleviating geographical bottlenecks and reducing the financial burden of physical travel for applicants and their attorneys.

3. Direct Recognition of Well-Known Trademarks (Rule 124)

Perhaps the most legally significant paradigm shift introduced by the 2017 Rules is the operationalisation of Rule 124 regarding 'Well-Known Trademarks'.[27] Historically, a brand could only be legally recognised as a 'well-known trademark' in India as a byproduct of a lengthy, adversarial judicial proceeding—such as an infringement suit, opposition, or rectification hearing before a High Court or the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB).

Additionally, Rule 124 allows anyone to request the direct enrollment of a mark as a well-

known mark via an administrative, non-adversarial route. The application must be accompanied by a statement of the case, substantial documentary evidence of the brand's reputation, and documents, along with the payment of a hefty fee of Rs. 1,00,000 (~1400 USD) filed via Form TM-M. If the Registrar is satisfied with the evidence, the mark is published in the journal and added to the official list of well-known trademarks, completely bypassing the necessity of costly and protracted litigation.

Global Harmonisation and International Treaties

Industrialisation emphasised trade and commerce, so related aspects gained immense importance on the global stage. The establishment of the WTO and the adoption of the TRIPS (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) agreement at the international level necessitated the rationalization and harmonization of trademark laws worldwide.[28]

Negotiated during the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) between 1989 and 1990, TRIPS became effective on January 01, 1995. WTO agreements like TRIPS fostered international trade by creating a single, standardised market framework. TRIPS mandated that all WTO member nations adopt stringent minimum standards for the protection and enforcement of intellectual property. It ensures that member states uphold the principles of 'national treatment' (non-discrimination between domestic and foreign entities) and 'most-favoured-nation treatment', thereby providing an equitable legal environment for multinational corporations operating across borders. For India, compliance with the TRIPS Agreement necessitated the comprehensive overhaul of its domestic legal framework, culminating in the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

Further, amendments to other trademark-related agreements administered by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) also called for overhauling India's trademark law. These international developments introduced new types of trademarks and streamlined administrative processes. The primary treaties governing the global trademark architecture include:

International Treaty	**Primary Function within Global Trademark Architecture**
Nice Agreement (1957)	Establishes the International Classification of Goods and Services. It provides a universally standardised system of 45 classes (34 for goods, 11 for services) used to categorise trademark registrations globally, simplifying administrative searches.[29]
Vienna Agreement (1973)	Establishes an International Classification of the Figurative Elements of Marks. It allows trademark offices to systematically categorise and search complex logos and visual symbols.
Madrid Agreement (1891) & Protocol (1989)	The primary international system for facilitating the registration of trademarks in multiple jurisdictions. By filing a single application and paying one set of fees, an owner can seek protection in over 100 member countries simultaneously.
Trademark Law Treaty (1994) & Singapore Treaty (2006)	Harmonises and simplifies the administrative procedures related to trademark applications. The Singapore Treaty notably accommodates electronic filing and the registration of non-traditional marks like holograms and sound marks.

As a signatory to these agreements, India enacted new legislation in 1999 to bring its domestic trademark law in line. The Indian Trademarks Act covers registrable and unregistrable marks, the trademark registration procedure including opposition proceedings, enforcement of trademarks, and remedies for infringement. The Act has been successfully adapted to meet such international standards.

The Socio-Economic Functions of Trademark Law

Now, the goodwill and reputation associated with trade also matter immensely in the valuation of modern corporations. Marketing and advertising influence consumers heavily towards

products and services. Similarly, marks and symbols representing goods and services connect consumers and traders in a psychological and economic loop. The cumulative result of this historical, statutory, and international evolution is that the modern trademark serves profound socio-economic functions that extend far beyond the parameters of its medieval origins. Hence, the functions of trademark law are as under, some of the key ones being:

1. Identifying the physical source of goods and services: The idea that a trademark signifies the physical and commercial origin of goods and services is long-established. As one expert put it, a brand is like a seal of authenticity, allowing consumers to judge quality by the mark rather than inspecting each product individually.[30] The link between a trademark and its owner can be viewed objectively or subjectively. Objectively, consumers see the mark and automatically assume a connection to the owner or their affiliate. Subjectively, the owner identifies their goods by applying their mark before the goods reach the open market. This latter sense of identification has been significant in major litigation regarding parallel imports and grey market goods.

2. Guaranteeing consistent source identity: According to established case law, a trademark's essential role is to guarantee that products come from the exact same source, enabling consumers to distinguish them from goods of different, potentially inferior, origin. For trademarks to enable fair competition, all goods bearing the mark must originate from a single entity that remains legally responsible for their quality. The philosophical difference between guaranteeing source identity and guaranteeing the source itself is debatable, but the economic result is identical: market predictability.

3. Guaranteeing consistent quality: Consumers can, and do, rely on a trademark to obtain the desired product quality without exhaustive pre-purchase research. Trademarks enable choosing between competing items by allowing buyers to quickly differentiate them on crowded retail shelves. The trademark represents an implicit contractual promise of satisfaction. Notably, these functions only exist between the owner and actual or potential consumers. Under the quality guarantee view, trademarks obligate owners to consumers. The identity guarantee sees trademarks as separating competing businesses, preventing monopolistic free-riding.

4. Enabling lifestyle statements: For consumers in advanced, service-oriented economies, trademarks have become powerful fashion and cultural symbols. Fashion marks do much more than show the origin or quality of products. They let consumers make profound statements

about their identity, socio-economic status, and personal values. For example, wearing Nike sportswear communicates to society, "I am young, oriented toward physical challenges and achievements, and have a cool attitude." The mark itself becomes the product.

5. Building brand value and advertising: A trademark represents its manufacturer's brand equity. When consumers recognise the manufacturer behind goods, the manufacturer can promote and cross-sell through the trademark. Marks become the ultimate branding anchors in which promotional capital is invested, and that resulting commercial value merits strict protection even without direct misrepresentations of origin or quality.

Conclusion

The evolutionary arc of trademark law—from the rudimentary physical branding of livestock in the Neolithic era to the highly complex, digitally integrated regulatory frameworks of the twenty-first century—highlights the indispensable role that intellectual property plays in human economic progress. Historical records demonstrate that as commerce expanded in scope and complexity—from local guild monopolies to transcontinental maritime trade, and finally to borderless digital e-commerce—the legal mechanisms designed to govern it underwent necessary, and often radical, metamorphoses.

The transition from the tortious deceit doctrines of the early common law to the expansive statutory protections of the modern era reflects a continuous, global effort to balance competing economic interests. The architecture of modern trademark law, particularly as evidenced by the Indian statutory overhauls culminating in the Trade Marks Act of 1999 and the highly progressive, efficiency-driven Trade Marks Rules of 2017, effectively balances the monopolistic, proprietary interests of corporate entities with the fundamental public requirement for fair, transparent, and non-deceptive market practices. By integrating seamlessly with global harmonisation treaties under the aegis of the WTO and WIPO, domestic trademark frameworks now possess the legal agility to confront the unprecedented challenges of domain name cybersquatting, cross-border infringement, and the registration of non-traditional branding elements. Ultimately, the trademark has definitively transitioned from a mere mark of origin to an immensely powerful symbol of corporate identity and global economic vitality.

References

[1]: WIPO, A History of Trademarks: From the Ancient World to the 19th Century, WIPO, https://www.wipo.int/en/web/podcasts/madrid/transcripts/international_trademark_system_talk_01.

[2]: WIPO, Trademarks: Past and Present, WIPO, https://www.wipo.int/en/web/wipo-magazine/articles/trademarks-past-and-present-34704.

[3]: Walter E. Meyer, Evolutionary Theory and the Origin of Property Rights, Yale Law School, https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=1&article=1002&context=propertyjournal&type=additional.

[4]: J. Baines & D. Cao, Material, spatial, and social contexts of early writing: Egypt and China, De Gruyter 71-127 (2024).[4]

[5]: Lex-Warrier, Trademarks: What it is...!!, Lex-Warrier, December 07, 2012, https://lex-warrier.in/archives/trademarks-what-it-is.html.

[6]: Bakers Marking Law, 1266.

[7]: *Southern v How* .

[8]: Lex-Warrier, Trademarks: What it is...!!, Lex-Warrier, December 07, 2012, https://lex-warrier.in/archives/trademarks-what-it-is.html.

[9]: WIPO, Trademarks: Past and Present, WIPO, https://www.wipo.int/en/web/wipo-magazine/articles/trademarks-past-and-present-34704.

[10]: Bakers Marking Law, 1266.

[11]: *Southern v How* .

[12]: *Yale Elec. Corp. v Robertson* 26 F.2d 972 (1928).

[13]: Trade-mark Act, 1946, Section 10.

[14]: ICANN, Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, ICANN, October 24, 1999, https://www.icann.org/udrp/udrp-policy-24oct99.htm.

[15]: Kautilya, *Arthashastra*.

[16]: Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875.

[17]: Specific Relief Act, 1877, Section 54.

[18]: Indian Registration Act, 1908.

[19]: Trade Marks Act, 1940.

[20]: Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958.

[21]: *Abercrombie & Fitch Co. v Hunting World, Inc.* 537 F.2d 4 (1976).

[22]: *Laxmikant V. Patel v Chetanbhat Shah & Anr.* (2002) 3 SCC 65.

[23]: *Sumat Prasad Jain v Sheojanam Prasad Dead and State of Bihar* AIR 1972 SC 2488.

[24]: Trade Marks Act, 1999.

[25]: Trade Marks Rules, 2017, Rule 34.

[26]: Trade Marks Rules, 2017, Rule 115.

[27]: Trade Marks Rules, 2017, Rule 124.

[28]: Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, 1994, Art. 15.

[29]: Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the Purposes of the Registration of Marks, 1957.

[30]: Lex-Warrier, Trademarks: What it is...!!, Lex-Warrier, December 07, 2012, https://lex-warrier.in/archives/trademarks-what-it-is.html.

Bibliography

- A History of Trademarks: from the Ancient World to the 19th Century - WIPO, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.wipo.int/en/web/podcasts/madrid/transcripts/international_trademark_system_talk_01

- Trademarks Past and Present - WIPO, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.wipo.int/en/web/wipo-magazine/articles/trademarks-past-and-present-34704

- stone-age property in domestic animals: an essay for jim krier - W&M Law School Scholarship Repository, accessed March 22, 2026, https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?filename=1&article=1002&context=propertyjournal&type=additional

- The Nile and the Yellow River: Comparative Studies between Ancient Egypt and China | Cambridge Archaeological Journal, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/cambridge-archaeological-journal/article/nile-and-the-yellow-river-comparative-studies-between-ancient-egypt-and-china/27BF92624F0594256D4D22C6CCD54C65?ref=/core

- History of Trade Marks - Wilson Gunn, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.wilsongunn.com/history/history_trade_marks.html

- Applicability of Tort Law for Protection of Trademark - Walsh Medical Media, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.walshmedicalmedia.com/open-access/applicability-of-tort-law-for-protection-of-trademark-2375-4516-1000133.pdf

- kmscheiden_-_tm_outline_-_spring_2012_-_beebe.docx - NYU Law, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.law.nyu.edu/sites/default/files/upload_documents/kmscheiden_-_tm_outline_-_spring_2012_-_beebe.docx

- Trademark Assignment “With Goodwill”: A Concept Whose Time Has Gone - Marquette Law Scholarly Commons, accessed March 22, 2026, https://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1534&context=facp

ub

- Archives | Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy - ICANN, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.icann.org/udrp/udrp-policy-24oct99.htm
- Arthashastra - Wikipedia, accessed March 22, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthashastra
- NAVIGATING TRADEMARK PROTECTION IN INDIA: A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW - Indian Journal of Integrated Research in Law, accessed March 22, 2026, https://ijirl.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/NAVIGATING-TRADEMARK-PROTECTION-IN-INDIA-A-COMPREHENSIVE-OVERVIEW.pdf
- The Specific Relief Act, 1877 | 54. Perpetual injunctions when granted - Laws of Bangladesh, accessed March 22, 2026, http://bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/act-36/section-24788.html
- Indian Registration Act 1908: Complete Guide to Key Sections, Landmark Judgments & Draft Bill 2025 - - Lawsection.in, accessed March 22, 2026, https://lawsection.in/indian-registration-act-1908-complete-guide-to-key-sections-landmark-judgments-and-draft-bill-2025/
- Portal for Trademark: Vivek N Mapara Associates, accessed March 22, 2026, https://vnmlaws.com/trademark/trademark_laws_regulation.html
- 1 ABERCROMBIE & FITCH COMPANY v. HUNTING WORLD, INCORPORATED 537 F.2d 4 (2d Cir. 1976) Before FRIENDLY, TIMBERS and GURFEIN, accessed March 22, 2026, https://cyber.harvard.edu/people/tfisher/IP/1976_Abercrombie_Abridged.pdf
- Laxmikant V.Patel vs Chetanbhat Shah & Anr on 4 December, 2001, accessed March 22, 2026, https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1299452/
- SUMAT PRASAD JAIN Vs. SHEOJANAM PRASAD DEAD AND STATE OF BIHAR - The Laws, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.the-laws.com/encyclopedia/browse/case?caseId=002791404000&title=sumat-prasad-jain-

vs-sheojanam-prasad-dead-and-state-of-bihar

- First Amongst Equals: Review of the Historical Perspectives of the Trademark Legislation and Registration - Altacit Global, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.altacit.com/resources/trademark/first-amongst-equals-review-of-the-historical-perspectives-of-the-trademark-legislation-and-registration/

- Trade Marks Rules, 2017, accessed March 22, 2026, https://thc.nic.in/Central%20Governmental%20Rules/Mark%20Rules,%202017..pdf

- The Trade Marks Rules, 2017, India, WIPO Lex, accessed March 22, 2026, https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/legislation/details/15882

- The Trademark Provisions in the TRIPS Agreement - Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of Law, accessed March 22, 2026, https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1180&context=facsch_bk_contributions

- World Intellectual Property Organization - Wikipedia, accessed March 22, 2026, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Intellectual_Property_Organization