

DRAFT
GUIDELINES ON USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE
IN PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TRADE MARKS
REGISTRY

**Proposed by the Office of the Controller General of Patents,
Designs and Trade Marks (O/o CGPDTM)**

Prepared pursuant to the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi
in W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2026 (Stryten Energy LLC v. Nidhi Agarwal & Ors.)
Order dated 16.04.2026, Hon'ble Mr. Justice Tushar Rao Gedela

भारत सरकार

वाणिज्य और उद्योग मंत्रालय

कार्यालय महानियंत्रक एक्स्व अभिकल्प एवं व्यापार चिन्ह

बौद्धिक संपदा भवन, प्लॉट संख्या 32, द्वारका सेक्टर-14, नई दिल्ली - 110078

Government of India

Ministry of Commerce & Industry

Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs & Trade Marks

Boudhik Sampada Bhawan, Plot No. 32, Sector 14, Dwarka, New Delhi-110078

INDEX

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
—	PREAMBLE	4
I	PRELIMINARY	5
1	SHORT TITLE AND COMMENCEMENT	5
2	OBJECTIVE	5-6
3	DEFINITIONS	6-9
II	GENERAL PRINCIPLES	10
4	HUMAN PRIMACY AND ACCOUNTABILITY	10
5	TRANSPARENCY AND DISCLOSURE	10
6	VERIFICATION BEFORE SUBMISSION	10
7	INTEGRITY OF PROCEEDINGS	11
III	MANDATORY DISCLOSURE AND VERIFICATION	12
8	MANDATORY DECLARATION OF AI USE	12
9	SPECIFIC OBLIGATIONS IN RESPECT OF CASE LAW CITATIONS	12-13
10	APPLICABILITY AND SCOPE OF DECLARATION REQUIREMENT	13-14
IV	OBLIGATIONS OF EXAMINERS, REGISTRAR, AND REGISTRY OFFICERS	15
11	DUTIES OF REGISTRY OFFICERS	15
V	CONSEQUENCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE AND MISCONDUCT	16
12	CONSEQUENCES FOR PARTIES AND REPRESENTATIVES	16-17

13	REPORTING OF AI HALLUCINATION	17-18
VI	<u>SAFEGUARDS FOR AI-ASSISTED DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENTARY MATERIAL</u>	19
14	PROHIBITION ON AI-GENERATED SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT	19
VII	<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>	20
15	RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS	20
16	POWER TO AMEND	20
ANNEXURE I	<u>DECLARATION OF AI USE AND VERIFICATION BY PARTY/AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE</u>	21
ANNEXURE II	<u>REPORT OF SUSPECTED FABRICATED, FALSE, OR NON-EXISTENT CASE LAW CITATION, FACTUAL MISREPRESENTATION, OR FALSE/MISLEADING DECLARATION</u>	22



PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, in W.P.(C)-IPD 16/2026 (Stryten Energy LLC v. Nidhi Agarwal & Ors.), vide Order dated 16.04.2026, has directed the Trade Marks Registry (hereinafter referred to as 'the Registry') to furnish draft guidelines to check the use, abuse, and misuse of Artificial Intelligence-generated pleadings and representations that have resulted in the citation of false, fake, and non-existent case law in proceedings before the Registrar of Trade Marks;

WHEREAS, the rapid proliferation of Generative Artificial Intelligence tools has introduced novel risks to the integrity of quasi-judicial proceedings before the Registry, including fabrication of case citations (commonly known as 'AI hallucination'), submission of misleading factual representations, and misuse of AI-generated content by parties, agents, attorneys, and examiners/Registrar ;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers vested in the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 (47 of 1999) and the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, and in compliance with the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the following Guidelines are hereby issued:

1. Short title and commencement

1.1 These Guidelines may be called the 'Guidelines on Use of Artificial Intelligence in Proceedings before the Trade Marks Registry, 2026' (hereinafter 'the Guidelines').

1.2 These Guidelines shall come into force with immediate effect upon their notification by the Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, and shall apply to all proceedings pending as well as hereafter initiated before the Trade Marks Registry across all offices of the Registry in India.

2. Objective

2.1 The primary objective of these Guidelines is to:

- (a) Prevent the use, misuse, and abuse of Artificial Intelligence-generated content, including fabricated, false, or non-existent case law citations, in proceedings before the Trade Marks Registry;
- (b) Ensure transparency, disclosure, and human accountability for all AI-assisted submissions placed before the Registrar;
- (c) Establish a framework for verification, and consequences of non-compliance consistent with the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the Trade Marks Rules, 2017;
- (d) Protect the integrity of quasi-judicial proceedings before the Registry and ensure that decisions of the Registrar are based on verified, accurate, and authentic legal and factual material; and
- (e) Provide a deterrent against perjury and obstruction of justice arising from unverified AI-generated content.

2.2 These Guidelines shall apply to every application, affidavit, declaration, verification, undertaking, statement, electronic record within the meaning of *Section 2(1)(t)* of the Information Technology Act, 2000, documentary evidence, exhibit, audio recording, video recording, image, label, translation, certificate, invoice, advertisement, website extract, promotional material, market survey, sales data, metadata, or any other document or material filed before the Registry, whether at the stage of filing, examination, opposition, rectification, cancellation, renewal, assignment, recordal, or any other proceeding under the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

2.3 These Guidelines shall operate in addition to, and not in derogation of, the provisions of the:

- (i) *Trade Marks Act, 1999*;
- (ii) *Trade Marks Rules, 2017*;
- (iii) *Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023*;
- (iv) *Information Technology Act, 2000*;
- (v) *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023*; and
- (vi) any other law for the time being in force governing the admissibility and appreciation of evidence or the regulation of digital content and personal data; and the provisions of these Guidelines shall be construed as supplemental to, and not in substitution of, the provisions of the laws enumerated above. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the provisions of these Guidelines and the provisions of any statute or law, the provisions of such statute or law shall prevail to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency, as also provided under Clause 15.2

3. Definitions

3.1 In these Guidelines, unless the context otherwise requires:

(a) **'Artificial Intelligence' or 'AI'** means a machine-based system that infers, learns, and generates text, data, decisions, predictions, or recommendations from data with a varying degree of autonomy, deployed in the course of preparation or submission of any document, representation, pleading, affidavit, or evidence before the Trade Marks Registry, and includes Large Language Models, Generative AI systems, and Natural Language Processing tools; and shall have the same meaning as assigned to the expression "Artificial Intelligence (AI)" in Clause 6 of the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial and Court Administration, 2026, issued by the High Court of Gujarat, and shall be construed accordingly. .

(b) **"AI-Generated Content"** means any text, legal analysis, case citation, statutory reference, factual claim, argument, or any other material that has been produced or substantially contributed to by an Artificial Intelligence tool or system; and shall, in respect of audio, visual, or audio-visual content, include '*synthetically generated information*' within the meaning of Rule 2(1)(wa) of the Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Amendment Rules, 2026.

(c) **"Generative Artificial Intelligence" or "GenAI"** means a category of AI systems capable of generating new content including text, images, audio, video, or code in response to prompts, by learning statistical patterns and structures from large volumes of training data, and includes both generic large language model programmes and bespoke tools directed at legal professionals; and shall have the same meaning as assigned to the

expression "Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)" in Clause 6 of the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial and Court Administration, 2026, issued by the High Court of Gujarat

(d) **"Hallucination"** means the phenomenon whereby an AI system generates outputs that appear plausible or internally consistent but are factually incorrect, fabricated, or unsupported by verifiable source material, including the fabrication or misstatement of case citations, statutory provisions, rules, or legal propositions; and the fact that such an output is correctly formatted or internally consistent shall not, by itself, be treated as evidence of its accuracy. *(Adapted from the definition of "Hallucination" at Clause 6, read with the verification obligations at Clause 10, of the Gujarat HC Policy, 2026.)*

(e) **"Human-in-the-Loop"** means the requirement that a qualified human officer shall at all times review, verify, and be responsible for any AI-generated output before it is acted upon, filed, or submitted to the Registry, with no autonomous or unreviewed AI action permitted in any proceeding; final decision-making authority, responsibility, and accountability shall rest at all times with the submitting human, and the use of AI shall not constitute a defence to any finding of error, misconduct, or professional negligence. *(Adapted from Clause 3.2 "Human Supervision" and Clause 11 "Human Supervision and Personal Accountability" of the Gujarat HC Policy, 2026.)*

(f) **'Authorised Representative'** means a Trade Marks Agent registered under *Section 145* of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, an Advocate enrolled under the Advocates Act, 1961, or any other person duly authorised in the manner prescribed under *Rule 17* of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, to appear, act, or represent a party in any proceeding before the Registry.

(g) **'Proceeding'** includes any application for registration under *Section 18*, opposition under *Section 21*, rectification or cancellation under *Section 57*, or any other application, hearing, examination, ex parte hearing, inter partes hearing, or any other matter instituted or pending before the Registrar of Trade Marks or any officer to whom the powers of the Registrar have been delegated under *Section 3(2)* of the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

(h) **'Registrar'** means the Registrar of Trade Marks as defined under *Section 2(1)(y)* read with *Section 3* of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, and includes any officer to whom the powers of the Registrar have been delegated in writing under *Section 3(2)* of the Act.

(i) **"Registry"** means the Trade Marks Registry established under *Section 5* of the Trade Marks Act, 1999.

(j) **'Submission'** includes any written statement, representation, pleading, affidavit, evidence, counter-statement, written submission, synopsis, note, or any other document filed or submitted in any proceeding before the Registry in the manner prescribed under the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, applicable to the relevant application, opposition, rectification, cancellation, or other proceeding, including but not limited to Rules 42 to 50 thereof (governing opposition proceedings) and Rule 115 thereof (governing hearings), made in the course of a hearing before the officer.

(k) **'Verification'** means the process of independently confirming, through Authorised and Recognised Non-AI Legal Sources (as defined in this sub-clause), the existence, accuracy, correct citation details, correct *ratio decidendi*, finding, or holding, and relevance of each of the following elements included in a Submission:

(i) **'case law citation'** the name, number, court/tribunal, year, and, where available, volume and page/paragraph, of a reported or unreported judicial or quasi-judicial decision of a court or tribunal of competent jurisdiction;

(ii) **'statutory provision'** the section, rule, notification, or order as published in the Official Gazette of India under Section 159 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, or equivalent official publication; and

(iii) **'factual assertion'** any material statement of fact relied upon in the Submission.

For the purposes of these Guidelines, **'Authorised and Recognised Non-AI Legal Sources'** means the following Indian legal sources, accessed independently by the verifying person without reliance on the output of an AI:

(A) the official websites of the Supreme Court of India and the High Courts;

(B) the Official Gazette of India, or official publications, notifications, or circulars of the Government of India or the Office of the Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks;

(C) certified copies of judgments, orders, or decisions obtained from the relevant Court, Tribunal, or the Registry;

(D) established Indian law reports and legal databases, such as AIJEL (All India Judgements Electronic Library), SCC Online, AIR (All India Reporter), and Manupatra; and

(E) the official website and e-filing/records portal of the Trade Marks Registry, in respect of orders, decisions, or proceedings of the Registrar

Provided that a citation or legal proposition retrieved from an AI shall not, by itself, be treated as having been verified from an Authorised and Recognised Non-AI Legal Source, unless independently cross-checked against one of the sources listed above.

(l) **'Party'** means, in relation to any proceeding before the Registry —

(i) the applicant for registration of a trade mark under Section 18 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999;

(ii) the opponent in opposition proceedings under Section 21 of the Act, read with Rules 42 to 50 of the Trade Marks Rules, 2017;

(iii) the registered proprietor of a trade mark;

(iv) the petitioner or applicant seeking rectification, cancellation, or removal of a trade mark under Section 47 or Section 57 of the Act, as the case may be, and, in relation to such proceedings, includes any "person aggrieved" within the meaning of those provisions;

(v) the respondent to any proceeding for rectification, cancellation, or removal referred to in sub-clause (iv);

(vi) any other person impleaded, or permitted to intervene, in a proceeding before the Registrar; and

(vii) the Authorised Representative appearing on behalf of any of the persons referred to in sub-clauses (i) to (vi), but only to the extent that a provision of these Guidelines expressly imposes an obligation on the Authorised Representative distinct from that imposed on the party represented;

3.2 Words and expressions used in these Guidelines and not defined herein shall have the same meanings as assigned to them in the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, as the context may require.

4. Human primacy and accountability

4.1 The use of an AI in any proceeding before the Trade Marks Registry shall at all times remain strictly subservient to human judgment and accountability.

4.2 No person shall be permitted to disclaim responsibility for a false or fabricated submission by attributing the error to an AI

5. Transparency and disclosure

5.1 Every submission that has been prepared in whole or in part with the assistance of any AI shall be accompanied by a mandatory disclosure declaration in the form prescribed under Annexure I to these Guidelines.

5.2 The obligation of disclosure is absolute. Failure to disclose AI use when it has occurred shall be treated as a misrepresentation to the Registry and shall attract consequences under Chapter V of these Guidelines.

6. Verification before submission

6.1 Every case law citation, statutory provision, rule, and legal proposition contained in a Submission that has been generated or contributed by any AI shall be independently verified through Authorised and Recognised Non-AI Legal Sources, as defined in Clause 3(k), prior to submission.

6.2 Every material factual assertion contained in a Submission that has been generated or contributed by any AI shall be independently verified by the declarant against the underlying record, document, or personal knowledge on which such assertion is based, and shall be affirmed by the declarant as accurate to the best of their knowledge and belief, prior to submission.

6.3 The person verifying the submission shall certify, in the Annexure I declaration, that each case law citation, statutory provision, rule, and legal proposition has been verified in accordance with Clause 6.1, and that each material factual assertion has been verified in accordance with Clause 6.2.

7. Integrity of proceedings

7.1 Every submission filed before the Registry is an instrument of a quasi-judicial proceeding. An authorised Representative filing a submission owes a paramount duty of candour to the Registry.

7.2 The citation of false, fabricated, or non-existent case law before the Registrar, whether generated by any AI constitutes a serious breach of this duty of candour and shall constitute grounds for action under these Guidelines and applicable law

CHAPTER III: MANDATORY DISCLOSURE AND VERIFICATION

[Back](#)

8. Mandatory declaration of AI use

8.1 Every Authorised Representative who files any submission in a proceeding before the Trade Marks Registry, wherein AI has been used in the preparation of such submission, shall file, simultaneously with such submission, a declaration in the form prescribed under Annexure I to these Guidelines.

8.2 The declaration under Clause 8.1 shall specifically state that all case law citations, statutory references, rules, legal propositions, and material facts generated or suggested by an AI have been independently verified by the declarant in accordance with Clause 6, that no such content has been included in the submission without such independent verification, and that the declarant accepts full personal responsibility for the accuracy, authenticity, and integrity of the submission.

8.3 Every submission filed before the Registry shall be accompanied by a single declaration in the form prescribed under Annexure I to these Guidelines, stating whether or not the submission has been prepared with the assistance of an AI. Where AI has been used, the declarant shall additionally comply with the requirements of Clause 8.2. Where AI has not been used, it shall be sufficient for the declarant to so state in the said declaration, and no further particulars under Clause 8.2 shall be required.

8.4 Every declaration under Clause 8.1 shall be duly signed by the person filing the submission and, in the case of submissions filed through an Authorised Representative, shall additionally be signed and verified by such Authorised Representative, certifying that such Authorised Representative has discharged the verification obligations under Clause 6.

9. Specific obligations in respect of case law citations

9.1 Where any case law citation is included in a submission that has been generated or contributed by any AI, the Authorised Representative shall, in addition to the declaration under Clause 8, ensure that:

(a) each case cited actually exists and has been reported or decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the jurisdictional High Court, or any other court or judicial forum of competent jurisdiction stated;

(b) the citation details including case name, relevant Hon'ble court, year, volume, and page/paragraph are accurate;

(c) the holding, finding, or observation attributed to the cited case accurately reflects what is actually stated therein; and

(d) the case is relevant to the proposition for which it is cited:

Provided that no action shall lie under these Guidelines solely on the ground that the relevance of a case law citation, as required under sub-clause (d), is disputed; action shall lie in respect of sub-clauses (c) and (d) only where a case law citation is shown to be non-existent, or to deliberately or recklessly attribute to it a proposition of law, holding, finding, or observation that it does not, in fact, contain.

9.2 Where an AI has suggested or provided a case law citation, the Authorised Representative shall access the full text of the said judgment from an authorised and recognised non-AI legal source and verify the correctness of all the above elements before inclusion.

9.3 The filing of a case law citation that does not exist or is misleading the holding of the cited case shall constitute a ground for action under clause 12, regardless of whether such incorrect citation originated from an AI .

10. Applicability and scope of declaration requirement

10.1 The declaration under Clause 8 shall be required in respect of the following categories of submissions:

(a) Counter-statements and replies in opposition proceedings, and interlocutory application filed in the course of any proceeding;

(b) Written submissions and synopsis filed at any stage of hearing before the Registrar;

(c) Affidavits by way of evidence, to the extent the covering affidavit or exhibits contain AI-generated content;

(d) Applications for rectification, cancellation, or removal of a trade mark;

(e) Any representation, reply, or communication filed in response to an examination report or show cause notice; and

(f) Any other document filed in any proceeding before the Registry wherein the substantive legal content has been prepared in whole or in part with the assistance of an AI.

CHAPTER IV: OBLIGATIONS OF EXAMINERS, REGISTRAR, AND REGISTRY OFFICERS

[Back](#)

11. Duties of Registry Officers

11.1 Every Officer, Registrar of Trade Marks, or any other officer exercising statutory, administrative, or quasi-judicial functions under the Trade Marks Act, 1999 shall ensure that the use of Artificial Intelligence remains strictly ancillary to the discharge of official functions and shall not permit any AI to substitute or influence independent statutory decision-making.

11.2 No Officer shall rely upon, reproduce, or incorporate any legal proposition, statutory interpretation, factual statement, or judicial precedent generated through an AI, unless the same has first been independently verified from 'authorised and recognised non-AI Legal Sources'.

11.3 The Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trademarks may, by general or special order, prescribe additional safeguards, approved AI systems, verification protocols and security standards for official use of Artificial Intelligence within the Registry.

CHAPTER V: CONSEQUENCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE AND MISCONDUCT

[Back](#)

12. Consequences for parties and representatives

12.1 The Registrar or any other officer under his delegated authority, may initiate proceedings under this Clause, either suo motu or upon a request made by party in the manner prescribed, where the Registrar has reason to believe, or is of the prima facie opinion, that:

- (a) a false or fabricated case law citation has been cited in a submission, whether or not generated by an AI;
- (b) a submission prepared with the assistance of an AI has been filed without the declaration required under Clause 8;
- (c) the contents of a declaration filed under Clause 8 are false, misleading, or inaccurate; or
- (d) the submission contains misleading or fabricated factual material generated by an AI.

12.2 Where the Registrar proposes to initiate proceedings under this Clause, a show-cause notice shall be issued to the concerned Authorised Representative or party in person, affording an opportunity of being heard. Where such proceedings are initiated upon a request made by applicant/opponent under Clause 12.1, such party shall also be permitted to submit a written representation or be afforded an oral hearing, as the Registrar considers appropriate.

12.3 Upon hearing the matter, the Registrar may, by an order recording reasons in writing —

- (a) strike off and disregard the false, fabricated, or non-existent case law citation alone; or
- (b) strike off and disregard the submission or document in its entirety, where it includes the said case law citation as the Registrar considers appropriate having regard to the nature and materiality of the citation to the submission as a whole.

12.4 In addition to the action under Clause 12.3, the Registrar may—

- (a) in the case of an Authorised Representative, refer the matter, as the facts may warrant, to the competent authority for disciplinary action in accordance with the applicable Code of Conduct for Trade Mark Agents or, until such Code of Conduct comes into force, to the Ad hoc Disciplinary Committee for Trade Mark Agents, for misconduct before the Registry or for perjury; and

(b) where the Authorised Representative is an Advocate, refer the matter to the competent Bar Council for appropriate disciplinary proceedings under the Advocates Act, 1961 and the rules framed thereunder.

13 . Reporting of AI hallucination

13.1 Any party, Authorised Representative, or officer who detects a potentially fabricated, false, or non-existent case law citation, or a factual misrepresentation, in any submission shall bring the same to the attention of the Registrar at the earliest opportunity, by way of a report in the form prescribed under Annexure II to these Guidelines. Such report shall be accompanied by:

(a) identification of the specific case law citation, statutory reference, or factual assertion alleged to be fabricated, false, non-existent, or misrepresented;

(b) the material or documents relied upon by the reporting person in support of the allegation; and

(c) where the report alleges a false or misleading declaration filed under Clause 8, the specific declaration and the grounds on which it is alleged to be false or misleading.

13.2 Upon receipt of a report under Clause 13.1, the Registrar shall call upon the party who filed the submission through Annexure II, as defined in Clause 3(k), to substantiate the same by producing such proof or supporting material within such period as the Registrar may specify. The Registrar may, where considered necessary, call for such further information, material or documents from the reporting person or the party against whose submission the report has been made, as may be necessary for determination of the report. Upon consideration of the report and the material placed on record, if the Registrar is satisfied that the report is frivolous, vexatious or otherwise without sufficient basis, the Registrar may close the report by a reasoned order and take such further action as may be warranted under Clause 12.

13.3 Where the party fails to produce such proof within the time specified in clause 14.2, or where the cited material is confirmed to be fabricated or non-existent, the Registrar shall issue a show-cause notice to the party and, after affording an opportunity of being heard, record a finding thereon and proceed in accordance with clause 12.

13.4 Nothing in this clause shall preclude the Registrar from proceeding directly under clause 12 where fabrication is apparent on the face of the record.

13.5 No adverse consequence shall attach to any person for a report made in good faith under Clause 13.1.

13.6 Where a report under Clause 13.1 is found by the Registrar to be frivolous or vexatious, the person making such report shall be liable to such action as the Registrar may deem fit under Clause 12, including reference for disciplinary action where the reporting person is an Authorised Representative.

13.7 The pendency of any verification under this Clause shall not, unless otherwise directed by the Registrar for reasons to be recorded in writing, operate as a stay of, or otherwise impede, the proceedings in the relevant matter, nor shall it extend, suspend, or otherwise affect any statutory or prescribed time limit applicable thereto.

CHAPTER VI: SAFEGUARDS FOR AI-ASSISTED DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENTIARY MATERIAL

[Back](#)

14 . Prohibition on AI-generated substantive content

14.1 No AI shall be used to generate, author, embellish, strengthen, dilute, fabricate, or otherwise alter the substantive content of any affidavit, declaration, verification, undertaking, or statement intended to represent the personal knowledge, belief, opinion, affirmation, or verification of an applicant, registered proprietor, opponent, rectification applicant, deponent, declarant, or Authorised Representative.

14.2 No applicant, registered proprietor, opponent, rectification applicant, or Authorised Representative shall use any AI to generate, fabricate, materially manipulate, or digitally alter any document, electronic record, image, label, invoice, sales data, market survey, website extract, advertisement, promotional material, certificate, translation, proof of use, assignment document, or any other material submitted before the Registry in support of any application, request, opposition, rectification, cancellation, or other proceeding.

14.3 A contravention of Clause 14.1 shall render the document or material concerned liable to exclusion from the record and shall render the person responsible liable to action under Chapter V.

14.4 Where the Registrar has reason to believe that the authenticity or integrity of any document or material is in question on the ground of possible AI generation, digital manipulation, or other falsification through the use of an AI, and that such material is liable to mislead the Registry or prejudice the rights of any person, the Registrar may, after affording the party relying upon such material a reasonable opportunity of being heard and after recording reasons in writing, in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 127 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999—

- (a) direct production of the original or native file;
- (b) require production of metadata, audit trails, creation history, server logs, or other digital records establishing authenticity;
- (c) reject, exclude, strike off, or direct the removal of such document or material from the record where its authenticity is not established to the satisfaction of the Registrar or where it is found to be fabricated, materially manipulated, or otherwise unreliable;
- (d) draw such adverse inference against the party relying upon such material as may be warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case; and
- (e) pass such further or consequential orders as the Registrar may deem fit and proper in the interests of justice, including initiation of proceedings under Chapter V of these Guidelines or under any other applicable law.

CHAPTER VII: MISCELLANEOUS

[Back](#)

15 Relationship with other laws and regulations

15.1 These Guidelines shall be supplemental to, and not in derogation of, the provisions of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, the Trade Marks Rules, 2017, the Advocates Act, 1961, the rules framed by the Bar Council of India, the applicable statutory and regulatory framework governing Trade Marks Agents, the Information Technology Act, 2000, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, and any other law, rule, regulation, notification, direction, guideline or statutory instrument for the time being in force.

15. 2 In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between any provision of these Guidelines and any applicable law, rule, regulation or other statutory instrument, the provisions of such applicable law, rule, regulation or statutory instrument shall prevail to the extent of such conflict or inconsistency.

15.3 Upon their issuance, notification or coming into force, as the case may be, these Guidelines shall be construed, applied and implemented in harmony with the Supreme Court Artificial Intelligence Regulations, 2026, the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology Artificial Intelligence Guidelines, 2026, and any other applicable regulatory framework governing the development, deployment or use of Artificial Intelligence. These Guidelines may be reviewed and amended, from time to time, to ensure continued conformity and consistency with such regulatory framework.

16 Power to amend

16.1 The Controller General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks may, from time to time, amend, modify, or supplement these Guidelines in light of:

- (a) Directions or orders of any competent court;
- (b) Developments in AI technology;
- (c) Practical experience in implementation

ANNEXURE-I

[Back](#)

DECLARATION OF AI USE AND VERIFICATION BY PARTY/AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE

(In The Proceedings Before The Registrar Of Trade Marks)

Name of Trade Mark: _____

Trade Mark Application/Opposition/Rectification No.: _____

Name of Applicant/Opponent/Petitioner: _____

Name of Authorised Representative/Agent/Advocate (if any): _____

DECLARATION

1. I, _____, being the Authorized Representative/party appearing in person in the above proceedings, do hereby declare that I have exercised due care to verify the authenticity and accuracy of all judicial precedents, case law citations, statutory provisions, and other legal authorities cited or relied upon in this filing.
2. I further declare that I have complied with the Guidelines on Use of Artificial Intelligence in Proceedings before the Trade Marks Registry, 2026, and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all case law citations, extracts, quotations, and references contained in this filing are accurate, relate to existing legal authorities, and are not false, fabricated, fictitious, or materially misleading.
3. I acknowledge that I am responsible for the contents of this filing, including the accuracy of all legal authorities cited therein, and that any citation or legal content initially sourced through AI any other technological assistance, or even otherwise has been independently verified, in accordance with the aforesaid Guidelines, by me before being relied upon or included in this filing.
4. I also understand that a false or misleading declaration may result in the present filing, or any part thereof, being struck off or disregarded, and may also render me liable to disciplinary proceedings and any other action permissible under law.

Signed this _____ day of _____, 20 ____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Capacity (Authorised Representative / Party in Person): _____

ANNEXURE-II

[Back](#)

Report of Suspected Fabricated, False, or Non-Existent Case Law Citation, Factual Misrepresentation, or False/Misleading Declaration

I, _____, being the Applicant/Opponent/other party, appearing in person/through an Authorised Representative, in Trade Mark Application/Opposition/Rectification No. _____, concerning the trade mark “_____”, hereby report that the submission titled “_____”, filed by _____ on _____, appears to contain one or more of the following:

- a fabricated, false or non-existent case law citation;
- a false or misleading statement of the judgment or finding in a cited case;
- a false or misleading statement of fact; and/or
- a false or misleading declaration under Clause 8.

I state that the basis for this report is as follows:

I annex hereto the material and documents in support of this report, being:

I hereby declare that the information furnished in this report, and the material annexed hereto, is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I understand that the Registrar may call for such further material or documents as may be considered necessary to determine this report and that if this report is found to be frivolous or vexatious, I may be liable to such action as the Registrar may deem fit under Clause 12 of the Guidelines on Use of Artificial Intelligence in Proceedings before the Trade Marks Registry, 2026.

Signed this _____ day of _____, 20____

Name: _____

Signature: _____

