Page 1160 - 1180

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 3 | Issue 6

2020

© 2020 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: https://www. ijlmh. com/

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (https://www. vidhiaagaz. com)

This Article is brought to you for "free" and "open access" by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact **Gyan@vidhiaagaz. com.**

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript at **editor. ijlmh@gmail. com.**

The Infringement of Trademark in the E-commerce Sphere - A Comparative Analysis of USA, European Union, United Kingdom & India

YASHWONT KIRAN S[1]

ABSTRACT

This research paper deals with the trademark's infringements specifically in the e-commerce circle. Generally, the e-commerce industries evolved during the late 20th century, and it was the time where even many people didn't even used the internet in many developing countries. The infringement of trademarks was seen as a common problem in offline shopping. Counterfeited goods can be easily found in the local markets even now with a low price in many developing countries. Still, the irony is even in this era of advancement of technology and more usage of the internet in this 21st century, many counterfeited consumer goods were found on online shopping websites. It needs to be prevented efficiently through due diligence obligations. The online business has paved an easy and straightforward path for infringing the trademark in the e-commerce sphere. Nowadays, e-commerce websites are assisted with artificial intelligence software, which sometimes recommends counterfeited goods to the customers. This leads to the question of liability for the infringement of trademarks. The e-commerce websites worldwide are just one of the platforms of shopping that must always be under the security check of the law enforcing authorities to prevent the infringement of trademarks.

Keywords: Trademark, Infringement, Counterfeit, E-Commerce, Online, Goods

I. INTRODUCTION

With globalization and substantial headway of advancements, our general public and its information-making have also changed consistently. The extension and scope of information have extended and is just a tick away because of the development of a computerized network. Anyway, with each master come the cons. Infringement of trademark in the e-commerce sectors are considered as considerable dangers hampering the growth of the Internet, web-based business, and computerized economy. The buying cycle changed again with the presentation of Internet shopping. The items accessible to the customer expanded dramatically, and with it, the item data and information on the shopper. Once more, there was

[1] **Author is a LL.M in Intellectual Property and Trade Law Student at School of Law, Christ University, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India, India.**

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

no channel between the shopper and the item; the purchaser was in finished control of the buying choice. The buying cycle structure is evolving once more, seemingly, with the presentation of AI applications, for example, Amazon Alexa, Google Home, buyer chatbots, AI individual shopping associates, for example, Mona, Amazon Dash, and AI robot partners, for instance, Pepper. Many customers around the world don't designate the buying choice to an AI application like Amazon Alexa or etc.

Nonetheless, to the extent that the AI application (and not the purchaser) approaches all accessible data about the items at a bargain, the AI application is much the same as an individual customer. The purchaser may assign the buying choice to the AI application, with the AI application settling on that choice chiefly based on the customer's past acquisition. On the off chance that a human has no part in adding a marked item, at that point, by definition, the human must be puzzled at the purpose of receipt of the article, not at the retail location. The regular type of post-deal disarray concerns outsiders, not the buyer, but somewhat proactive retail could proclaim a different kind of post-deal chaos by the purchaser. By and large, an AI application, for example, Amazon Alexa, prescribes three items to the purchaser when provoked to look for an item to purchase. The buyer doesn't know about the full scope of items accessible available and is hence met with a generally restricted arrangement of things to buy, regardless of whether, at last, the person settles on the buying choice. The AI application again shapes a channel between the buyer and the brand which may be an original one or it may be a duplicate one with trademark infringements.

(A) Objectives

- To know about the history of the evolution of e-commerce
- To understand about the intermediator’s liability of trademark infringement in the e-commerce websites
- To know about the case laws relating to the infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce websites
- To study about the infringement of trademarks in e-commerce websites within the USA
- To know about the infringement of trademarks in e-commerce websites within the UK and European Union
- To understand about the infringement of trademarks in e-commerce websites within India

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

- To know about the law relating to the due diligence obligation of various countries to prevent the infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce industry

(B) Research Problem:

The e-commerce websites acts as an intermediator between the buyer and seller for the purpose of being as a virtual platform to buy and sell the goods. The e-commerce website gives the authority to anyone to buy and sell the goods in online but meanwhile many trademark infringements occurs in the e-commerce websites because of non-verification of the authenticity of the goods. The e-commerce websites have their own terms and conditions relating to raising complaints against the counterfeited goods which are existing in the e-commerce websites but when the authenticity of the goods are manually verified before advertising or selling them in online then there will not be any burden to deal with the counterfeited goods in the e-commerce websites. The prevention of the counterfeited goods from e-commerce websites is possible only by manual verification of the authenticity of the goods. It is the legal duty of the e-commerce websites to follow the laws relating to due diligence obligation of various countries to prevent the counterfeiting goods from being sold or advertised in the websites which infringes the trademark of the original proprietors.

(C) Research methodology:

The research methodology is doctrinal. Some of the essential case laws relating to the infringement of trademarks are also analysed in the areas where it is precisely needed. The secondary sources play a significant role as the resources for this research. Those resources are studied and referred only for reference from various articles, blogs, and websites dealing with infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce sphere.

II. THE EVOLUTION OF E-COMMERCE SECTORS

The historical backdrop of trade extends back a great many years. Indeed, by contemplating business and exchange from an authentic viewpoint, you can build up an extensive comprehension of human progress. Shipping lanes, battles over admittance to assets, and the development of delivery advances, in addition to other things, have all greatly affected human culture. The historical backdrop of internet business is significantly more limited, yet it's just as significant for understanding our advanced society. The Internet has changed the retail industry, yet the world on the loose. And keeping in mind that web-based business is a generally new wonder in the recorded setting, it's likely somewhat more established than you might suspect.

Indeed, the principal web-based business exchange happened right in 1972 when understudies at MIT utilized the Arpanet (an archetype to the Internet) to buy some reefer from their Stanford partners. This unlawful arrangement is generally viewed as the primary online business exchange. By 2017, the online business industry had developed to over $2.3 trillion. By 2021, the web-based business market is relied upon to be worth almost $5 trillion. Online business has progressed significantly from its modest beginnings. So how about we investigate the historical backdrop of online business. By 1980, Aldrich was selling his Teleputer. Utilizing telephone lines, the Teleputer empowered straightforward internet business exchanges. Be that as it may, the Internet hadn't developed into the pervasive assistance it is today, and most sales were business-to-business.

In 1982, the Boston Computer Exchange was established. Some contend that the Boston Computer Exchange was the world's first web-based business organization. Utilizing on the web information bases, purchasers and vendors had the option to buy and sell PCs, parts, and like. The Boston Computer Exchange would, in the long run, extend its foundation to help different kinds of deals and even set up closeout programming. Notwithstanding, all through the 1980s, internet business stayed a little, specialty administration. Massive changes, notwithstanding, were not too far off.

The Emergence of the World Wide Web

During 1991, the internet opened up to the world. While research focuses and governments had been dabbling with different Internet-like foundations, it wasn't until 1991 when regular residents could start getting to the web through the World Wide Web program. In 1991 the National Science Foundation lifted limitations on business utilization of the "net" and considered business use. This started rapid development. By 1995, there'd be more than 120,000 enlisted area names, and by 1998 there were more than 2 million. As more individuals signed onto the Internet, more business people started searching for approaches to bring in cash, including through web-based business.

As far as income and showcasing capitalization, Amazon is currently the most prominent online business organization on the planet. The tech behemoth was established in 1994 by Jeff Bezos and, at first, centered on selling books. While Amazon currently rules quite a bit of downtown Seattle, it was first based on Bezo's carport in Bellevue. Amazon immediately developed and extended its item arrangement to incorporate recordings, CDs, and different items. By 1999, Time Magazine had named Jeffrey Bezos their "individual of the year" for advocating web-based business.

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

Nowadays, Amazon is a "beginning to end" retailer, offering a tremendous scope of physical and advanced items. Amazon Web Services (AWS) is also one of the most prominent cloud worker organizations globally. Amazon wasn't the leading internet business monster to arise during the 1990s. In 1995, Pierre Omidyar established eBay in his parlor. As opposed to selling merchandise straightforwardly, Omidyar assembled an offering stage that would permit individuals to sell and purchase items from each other.

The eBay and comparable sites made it simple for individuals who didn't have tech/web advancement abilities to sell merchandise on the web. Indeed, even independent companies and people could rapidly sell merchandise through eBay. Before long, innumerable individuals were getting by through online business. By the last part of the '90s, a few business visionaries were beginning to zero in creating administrations and applications for online business stores. Instead of selling merchandise straightforwardly, these organizations zeroed in on helping internet business organizations develop.

In 1998, Cofinity was established, and in 1999 Elon Musk set up x.com. These two organizations would become later union and structure PayPal, which has since developed into one of the biggest online installment processors on the planet. While PayPal is probably the most crucial name in online business, other installment suppliers, online business stages, and other internet business administration organizations started offering items and administrations.

By the end of the 1990s, online business was blasting. Arising organizations were selling practically all that you could consider. Furthermore, speculators accepted that the Internet was the following colossal thing. This prompted such a "dash for unheard of wealth" with financial specialists emptying gigantic measures of cash into online organizations.

Thus, this made an air pocket as speculators turned out to be exceptionally theoretical, pushing web organizations' estimation up to unreasonable levels. In 2000, the website bubble burst. Various organizations immediately collapsed, and the business experienced a time of solidification. Amazon, eBay, and others endure. In any case, numerous more modest organizations were either purchased out or fizzled.

In 2004, significant Visa processors collaborated and delivered the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS). These guidelines illustrated commitments and systems for preparing on the web installments and putting away information. The PCI DSS was set up because of uncontrolled digital assaults.

Made sure about installments are an absolute necessity for online business stores. That is the

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

reason PayKickstart works with confided in outsiders, as Paypal and Square, to handle installments securely. Sites and organizations that neglect to deal with the information appropriately could wind up on the snare for genuine liabilities.

In 2007, Steve Jobs disclosed the iPhone to the world. With cell phones, individuals abruptly had PCs in their pockets. They could ride the web and make buys from basically anyplace. This would hugely affect web-based business. Presently, cell phones represent generally 50% of all web traffic. Web-based business locales have zeroed in on creating versatile inviting sites and applications. At PayKickstart, we invested a ton of energy, making our shopping basket portable amicable also.

Going ahead, applications and versatile traffic are relied upon to assume an undeniably significant function in the internet business. Portable records for almost 35 percent of online business deals in 2017 and is extended to ascend to 54 percent by 2021. Amazon has arisen as the most prominent online business organization on the planet. Presently, Amazon permits more modest organizations and people to sell on their commercial center. This has helped Amazon snatch a much more significant portion of the market. Specialty and strength destinations have been arising as a mainstream option compared to Amazon and other enormous names. Destinations like thegadgetflow.com offer "curated" item arrangements, for instance. Going ahead, internet business locales should pressure their novel preferences and items.[2]

III. THE INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARKS IN E-COMMERCE WEBSITES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The **Lanham Act** of United States principally obliges the legal need of trademark law, yet doesn't bring inside its domain contributory trademark risk. This has made US courts to depend, for most parts, on customary law standards when confronted with the issues of contributory risk for trademark infringement. In straightforward terms, trademark infringement, by and large, happens when an unapproved utilization of a trademark is probably going to create turmoil, to cause botch, or to misdirect. Duplicating, being one such sort of trademark infringement means demonstrating false impersonation of something meaningful to trick or dupe. On such occasions, the teaching of contributory trademark infringement stretches out the obligation to the individuals who, however, not being an essential infringer, adds to the fake cycle.

[2]Michael Harbone, *The History & Evolution of Ecommerce,* PAY KICK START (Dec. 07, 2020, 10: 15 AM), https://paykickstart.com/the-history-and-evolution-of-commerce/.

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

To bring a case for contributory risk against an online commercial center, it must be demonstrated that, first, it had real or valuable information on the infringement, and second, it had intends to control infringement. The Supreme Court previously perceived the principle of contributory trademark obligation in a non-web field in ***Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc***[3] in the year 1982. The court said that a gathering is contributorily subject if the standard as set down are met: It purposefully initiates another to infringe a trademark; or keeps on managing the items which it accepts or has the motivation to buy is taking part in trademark infringement. Contributory trademark obligation in a web field was principal disputed in ***Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay Inc.***[4]

Tiffany and co. was a well-known jeweller perceived as a top-notch extravagance and style brand. Tiffany became mindful that fake Tiffany things are sold on eBay's site, for which, in the long run, Tiffany sued eBay. Tiffany battled that eBay was at risk for contributory trademark infringement since it was aiding the offer of fake items by which it inferred benefits. Alternately, eBay contended that it didn't have the imperative information on the infringement, which is an essential basis for contributory trademark obligation. The eBay battled that such summed up information was deficient in meeting the prerequisite of the Inwood test. The USA Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit held that eBay was not at risk for selling fake items since it had just summed up information concerning the counterfeit items being sold on its foundation. Tiffany's choice made the position indistinct as it respects the prerequisite of information to be appeared by online commercial centers. Another case that settled the equivocalness made by Tiffany's case was ***Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Akanoc Solutions, Inc***[5]., in which the court expressed that to demonstrate a lawsuit against an online commercial center, it is essential to show that supposed contributory infringer has helped with genuine or valuable information on trademark infringement. The previously mentioned cases feature the significance of genuine or helpful information concerning the auxiliary infringer as being one of the riders for building up contributory trademark risk about online commercial centers.

Aside from the information qualifier, the convention of contributory trademark infringement additionally assesses the 'control' component concerning the optional infringer to forestall infringement. In Tiffany, the court dissected that eBay had a setup enemy of duplicating programs, have a conventional notification, and bring down a methodology that speedily empowers eBay to eliminate the encroaching items from its site, and eBay had made

[3] **Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc, 456** U.S. **at** 853-54 (1982).
[4] **Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay Inc, 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir. 2010) (2010).**
[5] **Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Akanoc Solutions, Inc, 658 F.3d 936 (9th Cir. 2011) (2011).**

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

certifiable strides in recognizing fake Tiffany items. This infers that there was no other way that eBay might have embraced forestall or 'control' trademark infringement, especially without having explicit information on the encroaching items. In this way, in a way, the control component additionally helps in following the degree of information that the infringer has about the encroaching items, and the two bases as set down in the Inwood test is by all accounts interconnected in a manner that if one is demonstrated would offer a catalyst to the next.

Due Diligence obligations or preventive measures of USA:

The organisation called as National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center which is otherwise known as (IPR Center) is led by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Investigations. On January 24, 2020, the U.S. Department of Homeland security submitted a report to the ex-President of the USA known as Donald J. Trump, wherein the report it was stated that for counterfeiting goods, low production costs, millions of customers are available online, transactions are easy, and listing the number of goods on well-known platforms provides an air of legitimacy. When the sellers of illicit goods are in another country, they are also exposed to the relatively lesser risk of criminal prosecution or civil liability under current law enforcement and regulatory practices. Immediate action must be taken against the infringers and also against the intermediaries to protect American consumers and other stakeholders. The IPR Center also meets regularly with the automotive original equipment manufacturers through the Automotive Anti-Counterfeiting Council (A2C2) to address the sale and distribution of the counterfeited parts and components to unsuspecting consumers, including counterfeited parts' issuance through 3rd party marketplaces. The IPR Center, which Homeland Security and the Automotive Anti-Counterfeiting Council (A2C2) work together to provide training to federal and local law enforcement partners and payment processors on recognizing duplicate automotive parts and also conducting the criminal investigations and prosecutions.[6]

IV. THE INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARKS IN E-COMMERCE WEBSITES WITHIN THE JURISDICTIONS OF EUROPEAN UNION & UNITED KINGDOM

The European Union or (EU) comprises 27 Member States.[7] The EU has a point by point

[6]U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Combating Trafficking in Counterfeit and Pirated Goods - Report to the President of the United States,* U.S.A (Dec. 08, 2020, 02:00 PM), https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/p ublications/20_0124_plcy_counterfeit-pirated-goods-report_01.pdf.

[7]European Union, *27 Member Countries of EU* (Dec. 14, 2020, 10: 10 AM), https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en.

enactment on trademark legislation. From one viewpoint, there is EU enactment approximating the public trademark laws of the Member States. Then again, the EU has made the European Union Trade Mark (EUTM) framework, an inventive apparatus of European law and a unitary trademark obtained via a single filing with the European Union Intellectual Property Office which is otherwise known as EUIPO and applies to all the member States. The significant EU legislations or enactment on trademarks comprises of the accompanying:

- The directive (EU) 2015/2436 on the approximation of national laws of the Member States on trademarks;
- Regulation (EU) No. 2017/1001 regarding the EUTM;
- The directive 2004/48/EC on the enforcement or implementation of intellectual property rights; and
- Regulation (EU) No. 608/2013 on customs enforcement of intellectual property rights.

European Union:

In EU, the teaching of contributory trademark obligation isn't generally tended to as risk fundamentally. Or maybe Article 14 of the online business Directive puts a commitment over network access suppliers of eliminating any encroaching data forthwith after getting mindful of it. In 2011, ECJ administered on the risk of online commercial center opposite trademark infringement in the milestone instance of ***L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG.***[8] L'Oreal found that eBay was completing a few proposals available to be purchased as to L'Oreal items in its European site, which encroached L'Oreal's trademark. L'Oreal documented suit under the watchful eye of the High Court of Justice of England and Wales, Chancery Division, along with activities in different other EU part states. The judicial body in Europe known as the Court of Justice of the European Union's (CJEU's) held that since eBay has played a functioning function in giving help, specifically, enhancing the introduction of the proposals available to be purchased or advancing the encroached products and didn't act to eliminate or cripple the encroaching data in the wake of getting mindful of it, the exception under Article 14(1) of the Directive isn't accessible with eBay as a safeguard.

In ***Louis Vuitton v Google France***[9] decision, which concerned the issue of catchphrase promoting and the programmed decision of such watchwords in Google's AdWords framework, held that Google would not be at risk for trademark infringement except if they took an active part in the catchphrase publicizing framework.

[8]L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG, Case C-324/09, [2011] ECR I-6011 (CJEU July 12, 2011) (2011).
[9]Louis Vuitton v Google France, C-236/08 to C-238/08 (2010).

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

In the ***Coty v Amazon case***,[10] the inquirer, Coty Germany GmbH ('Coty'), is a fragrance wholesaler and licensee of the EU exchange mark DAVIDOFF. Amazon is significantly a notable commercial platform which offers the outside dealers the capacity to put offers available to be purchased regarding their products on Amazon's online commercial center, for this situation on the German webpage known as www.amazon.de. Where an item is offered, the agreement to buy the thing is finished up between the outsider vendor and the buyer, not Amazon. In any case, Amazon provides a plan whereby they will store outsider products in their distribution center and organize them to be dispatched upon deal. Coty asserted that Amazon had infringed its privileges in the DAVIDOFF exchange mark by putting away and despatching the counterfeited goods, mainly jugs of "Davidoff Hot Water" aroma, in the interest of an outsider vendor on the Amazon Marketplace.

Coty sued for trademark infringement under the watchful eye of the German courts. The activity was excused from the start example and on allure, yet Coty claimed further on a state of law to the Federal Court. The Federal Court made it very evident that it considered Amazon was not obligated for infringement. Instead, the result of the allure was subject to the correct understanding of Article 9 of the EU Trade Mark Regulation, a point on which it looked for the CJEU's info. For this situation, the CJEU thought about whether Amazon's simple stockpiling, without offering or aiming to provide the products available to be purchased or putting them available, would comprise 'use' and, consequently, encroach Coty's DAVIDOFF exchange mark. The idea of 'utilization' isn't characterized in the enactment; however, the Court deciphered its customary significance as including dynamic conduct and immediate or roundabout control of the demonstration establishing use. The Court called attention to that lone an outsider that has authority over a march of utilization can stop it and along with these lines consent to the forbiddance of infringement. The Court held that all together for Amazon's stockpiling of the encroaching Davidoff scent jugs to be named "use" of Coty's exchange mark, it was additionally crucial for Amazon itself to offer the merchandise available to be purchased or putting them available. The German Federal Court had made it clear in its inquiry to the CJEU that Amazon didn't sell, expect to sell, or put the encroaching merchandise available, so the CJEU held there was no utilization by Amazon of the infringing mark. While European courts' decisions are just authoritative on the particular Court of a Member express that has raised the inquiry, they have a convincing impact and direction on the topic.

[10]Coty v Amazon case, *EU: C: 2020:26,* (2020).

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

Due Diligence laws in European E-commerce:

In the analysis report given by the Commission's Public Consultation on the Regulatory Environment for Platforms, the sale of the counterfeit goods via the internet was judged at least as problematic by businesses as the availability of trademark infringing material on the internet. Rights holders in the trademark intensive industries have been similarly strong in their claims of damage which was caused by the infringements caused through the online or e - commerce. However, the Commission didn't initiated any legislative or legal action regarding combating trademark infringements on the internet as part of its self-professed problem-driven approach, announced in the communication following the consultation on online platforms. It actually told that it might consider the roles that intermediaries can play in protecting the IPRs, notably regarding counterfeit, in its upcoming review of the IPRED. The Intellectual Property Rights Enforcement Directive otherwise known as IPRED, or Enforcement **Directive 2004/48/EC** is an order of the European Union to expand punishments and eventually condemn "business" infractions of intellectual property law inside the EU.

Article 3 of the IPRED order contains an overall commitment for the Member States to give pragmatic, dissuasive, proportionate measures, cures, and strategies essential to guarantee the authorization of intellectual property rights. Nonetheless, those measures, methods and cures will be reasonable and even handed and will not be pointlessly muddled or expensive, or involve preposterous time-limits or inappropriate postponements. Those measures, systems, and cures will likewise be valuable, proportionate, and dissuasive. They will be applied in such a way as to stay away from the making of obstructions to genuine exchange and to accommodate shields against their maltreatment.[11]

United Kingdom:

A trademark which was registered in the United Kingdom has its legal protections in England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. The well-known law in UK which is known as the **Trade Marks Act, 1994**, deals with the law relating to trademarks in the UK. The registration process of trademarks in the UK is accomplished through the UK Intellectual Property Office (UKIPO). In the event that the UKIPO acknowledges enlistment, various elite rights are offered to the exchange mark proprietor. These rights permit the proprietor to forestall unapproved utilization of the imprint on indistinguishable items or like the registered mark. However, to maintain ownership of the mark, one must renew their trademark

[11]**Article 3, Directive 2004/48/EC.**

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

registration every ten years. It is essential to be aware of renewal dates as they approach and begin the process well in advance.

At the point when a similar matter of ***L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG***[12] was brought under the watchful eye of the UK courts, it was held that eBay was not vicariously subject to the demonstrations of the trademark infringement of the sellers/vendors utilizing the eBay's site for show and offer of items. The Court put together its judgment concerning the premises that 'simple help' is lacking to drag the online commercial centers inside the domain of contributory trademark risk. To be named an auxiliary infringer, eBay was more likely than not contrived with the essential infringer or obtained or instigated his bonus of the misdeed.

In ***Cosmetic Warriors Ltd and Lush Ltd v Amazon.co.uk Ltd and Amazon EU Sarl***[13] before the United Kingdom High Court, Amazon has discovered a subject for trademark infringement in the utilization of trademarks which set off connections to its site that didn't incorporate the marked item referred to, with the end goal that the purchaser couldn't tell whether the items discounted were those of the brand proprietor or not. Further, a progression of cases under the watchful eye of the Federal German Court concerning Ortlieb Sportartikel GmbH held Amazon at risk where advertisements on Amazon.de were set off by the utilization of the inquiry term "Ortlieb," based on its utilization in item portrayals just as based on past purchaser conduct, a vital part of AI applications. The courts contemplated that shoppers would have been "adapted" in the desire that Ortlieb and just Ortlieb items were being sold. In ***Interflora v Google***[14] in the UK did communicate the surprise that the EU Directive on the misleading and comparative advertising which is known as Directive 2006.114/EC had not been brought up all things considered in that case. Perhaps a case concerning an AI application occupied with near promoting will manage this issue head-on.

Due Diligence laws in United Kingdom's E-commerce:

Even though UK didn't enacted a well-established law relating to due diligence in the e-commerce sphere, the ***Electronic Commerce (EC Directive) Regulations 2002*** deals with the protection of rights of the parties which does not affect the rights of any party to apply or appear before a court for any kind of relief to prevent or stop infringement of any kind of rights and also any power of an administrative authority in any jurisdiction to prevent or stop

[12]L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG, [2009] EWHC 1094 (Ch), [2009] RPC 21.
[13]Cosmetic Warriors Ltd and Lush Ltd v Amazon.co.uk Ltd and Amazon EU Sarl [2014] EWHC 181 (Ch).
[14]Interflora v Google,[2013] EWHC 1291 (Ch), [2013] WLR(D) 206.

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

any kind of infringement of any rights shall strictly continue to apply.[15]

V. THE INFRINGEMENT OF TRADEMARKS IN E-COMMERCE WEBSITES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF INDIA

The Trademarks Act, 1999 is a legislation enacted exclusively by the parliament of India and it deals with the laws relating trademarks. The concept of trademark is one of the intellectual property rights which govern the aspects of trademark rights. After the independence of India, the Trade and Merchandise Marks Act, 1958 was in the force but later it was repealed by the Trademarks Act, 1999. The Trademarks Act, 1999 and the Trademarks Rules, 2017 deals with the laws relating to the trademark. The Trademarks Act, 1999 is the substantial law relating to the trademark and the Trademarks Rules, 2017 is the procedural law relating to the trademarks. The registration of trademark in India is very important because it gives a valid protection against the infringement of the trademarks.

Lately, there has been a spate of prosecution encompassing the online business or E-Commerce space and insusceptibilities stood to delegates or the intermediaries. Now everything can be chosen and also bought from the online websites and so the job and duties of online business organizations facilitating such stages has been lifted up. While in the case called as ***MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd.,*** the Court underlined on the requirement for safe harbour insurance or the protection to delegates or the intermediaries who follow notice and bring down technique with due diligence to not purposely have any infringing content.[16]

\In the case called as ***Christian Louboutin SAS v. Nakul Bajaj and Ors***[17]**,** the Court saw that the e-commerce or the internet business stages which effectively plan, abet or associate, or initiate commission of unlawful follows up on their site can't go without any penalty. The Court clarified that when a web based business stage turns into a functioning member instead of only being a mediator, at that point it would consequently lose safe harbour assurance. Such resistance can be given to just inactive transmitters of data on their foundation, which in the genuine sense is the function of go-betweens. In this way, the assurance stood to go-betweens isn't outright and on the off chance that they additionally start the transmission, select the recipient or choose or alter the data contained in the transmission then they may lose the resistance to which they are generally entitled. The severe methodology by the Court towards web based business players, which seems, by all accounts, to be the need of great

[15]Regulation 20, Electronic Commerce (EC Directive) Regulations 2002.
[16]MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd, 236 (2017) DLT 478 (2016).
[17]Christian Louboutin SAS v. Nakul Bajaj and Ors, 2018(76) PTC 508(Del), (2018).

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

importance, has not exclusively been embraced to slow down robbery and duplicating however to likewise shorten trademark infringement, everything being equal, – even as to offer of authentic marked items yet in "impaired" or adjusted conditions, and tortious interference in contractual commercial relationships, etc.

The Delhi High Court in a case known as ***Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. v. 1Mg Technologies Pvt. Ltd. and Anr***[18]***,*** alongside six different suits that were heard together, passed consolidated requests as a feature of a nitty gritty choice conveyed on July 8, 2019 against a few online business players. Every one of these cases included covering issues. One of the primary issues was the contention between Direct Selling Business and internet business stages. The offended party of this case known as Amway India Enterprises Ltd which is one of the world's biggest direct selling organizations, documented suits against various respondents (web based business organizations) to limit them from selling, offering available to be purchased and promoting or advertising the offended party's marked items with no permission or assent or approval. Amway's "Immediate Selling" model depends on the offer of items through direct merchant individuals under an agreement and is in consonance with the Direct Selling Guidelines, 2016 gave by the Indian Government. Preceding recording of the suit, Amway had sent quit it notification to these internet business elements discovered to sell its items without consent at costs a lot less expensive than the market value, which likewise prompted obstruction with the offended party's immediate selling concurrences with its merchants. Because of the quit it sees, the internet business substances wouldn't follow Amway's orders declaring that they were middle people qualified for safe harbour arrangements under **Section 79** (Seventy Nine) of the **Information Technology Act, 2000** and were just facilitators of the exchanges between the purchasers and the dealers. They additionally affirmed that the venders were liable for guaranteeing that they were approved to sell the items and the web based business stages required no such approval from the offended party. In the claims, Amway contended that the offer of its items on such online business or e-commerce sites didn't ensure the credibility or nature of such items. Likewise, there was messing with the bundling bringing about bury alia evacuation of its novel item codes that could influence Amway's standing, and the terms and states of offer, discount and return were additionally modified all of which presented it to the danger of losing its permit to lead business in India as a Direct Selling Entity. It was argued that such tortious impedance by the respondents would likewise antagonistically influence Amway's authoritative and business relationship with its Direct Sellers just as the relationship with its

[18]**Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. v. 1Mg Technologies Pvt. Ltd. and Anr, CS (OS) 410/2018 (2018).**

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

customers; successfully weakening and discolouring Amway's altruism and notoriety on the lookout. Based on Amway's case, neighbourhood magistrates were designated by the Court who visited the premises of the respondents and presented their reports. Temporary directives were additionally conceded in support of Amway.

The respondents of this case contended among various grounds that since the items sold on their foundation were certifiable, the offended parties can't block the merchants to sell the items and that such deals don't comprise trademark infringement. In addition, since they were simple facilitators of such deals as delegates, they can't be made subject. During the suit procedures the neighbourhood magistrates' report came up which entomb alia uncovered that on item bundles recuperated from the litigants' premises thinners were being utilized and that the special item codes were altered or by and large eliminated. The Court in the wake of hearing the gatherings outlined the accompanying primary issues:

- Whether the Direct Selling Guidelines, 2016 are legitimate and authoritative on the respondents and provided that this is true, how much?
- Whether the offer of offended parties' items on online business stages disregards its trademark rights or establishes distortion, passing off and brings about weakening and stains the altruism and notoriety of its brands?
- Whether online business stages are mediators qualified for security under the protected harbour given under the Section 79 (Seventy Nine) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the Intermediary Guidelines of 2011?
- Whether the online business players, for example, the respondents are blameworthy of tortious obstruction with the authoritative relationship of the Plaintiffs with their merchants/direct dealers?

On the first issue, the Court saw that Direct Selling Guidelines have been planned for securing the genuine rights and interests of the business and shoppers. It was seen that these rules were appropriately gazetted, have been actualized in an enormous number of states and establish restricting chief directions. Accordingly, they are not simply warning in nature but rather have the power of law. It was likewise seen that the whole immediate selling business is a managed exchange/business and in the current case, according to these Guidelines, the litigants were only needed to take assent of the offended parties (Direct Selling Entity) prior to offering available to be purchased or selling the offended parties' items on their foundation. As the Guidelines would be pertinent to "any individual who sells or offers available to be purchased any item or administration of a Direct Selling Entity" the equivalent would take

inside its ambit such web based business stages also who are selling the offended parties' items. The Court as needs be held that the Direct Selling Guidelines are official on web based business stages and the merchants on such stages.

On the second issue, the Court saw that in spite of the fact that offer of certified merchandise by online business stages without brand proprietors' assent would not ipso facto comprise infringement, anyway any weakness in the state of products through such deals including the state of bundling or related after deals administrations and so on, may establish infringement. According to the report of the nearby chiefs, the Court noticed that the internal seal of the items were broken, QR codes/interesting item codes eliminated using thinners, re-fixing of items done, new standardized tags appended, all under the influence and oversight of the respondents/online business organizations. Different sorts of altering the results of the offended parties were likewise found in the distribution centers claimed by the web based business stages.

The Court noticed that because of such altering there were negative client audits that made tremendous harm the standing and altruism of the offended parties' brands. All the respondents depended on Section 30 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999 ("the Act") that items once sold by the offended parties can't be controlled concerning resulting deals. Be that as it may, the Court depending on the perceptions put forth in the defense of ***Kapil Wadhwa and Ors. vs. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Anr***[19] noticed that debilitation of merchandise need not exclusively be physical to block the resistance/exception to the respondents from This issue also brings into discussion the doctrine of exhaustion of trademark rights which is also known as the ‘doctrine of First Sale’ as to whether the petitioners or plaintiffs can control or restrict the sale of their products by the defendants once the goods or products have been lawfully bought from the plaintiffs. Indeed, even contrasts in administrations and guarantees, publicizing and special endeavours, bundling, quality control, estimating and introduction would add up to debilitation of the items, under area 30(4) of the Act. Consequently, it was held that the regulation of depletion can't offer authenticity to such altering and mutilation of the items themselves and it was additionally seen that as these are magnificence and medical services items there could be extreme repercussions on the prosperity of shoppers. These were held to be real explanations behind the offended parties to contradict further dealings by the respondents under Section 30(4) of the Act. The Court additionally held and saw that legal obtaining of the offended parties' products has likewise not been set up and the offended parties have just 'put the merchandise in a market' which is

[19]Kapil Wadhwa and Ors. vs. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Anr, 2013 (53) PTC 112 (Del.) (DB) **(2013).**

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

specialty for example Direct Selling market, subject to conditions and that the monetary estimation of the merchandise is obviously being dissolved through unapproved deals on internet business stages. It was held that utilization of the trademark by the venders and the e-commerce stages is violative of the offended party's trademark rights and the litigants are not qualified for the guard under Section 30 of the Act. It was likewise held that such deals on these stages establish passing off, distortion and tarnishment of the plaintiffs' marks, products and businesses.

On the 3rd issue, the Court saw that an online business stage would be a delegate in the event that it is in the middle of the purchaser and dealer, acting only as an extension between the two. The inquiry is whether such web based business stages, who are not just detached players but rather are huge facilitators, additionally qualified for safe harbour resistances. It was seen that to be excluded from risk, go-betweens need to fulfill the conditions in Section 79(2) and ought not fall foul of Section 79(3) of the Information Technology Act. These incorporate entomb alia being practically restricted to the function of giving simple admittance to a correspondence framework for conveyance, transitory capacity and facilitating of third gathering data, seeing due diligence according to the Intermediary Guidelines and not to abet, contrive and help or actuate the commission of an unlawful demonstration/infringement of IPR and to likewise promptly eliminate and incapacitate admittance to encroaching material on being so informed. The Court saw that deciding if such online business stages are offering their own benefit added administrations and playing out a functioning job, subsequently knowing about/abetting the unlawful exercises whined of, would involve preliminary. It was held that any rebelliousness of the above due persistence prerequisites according to the Intermediary Guidelines and inability to cling to their own approaches would make the internet business stages subject.

On the fourth issue, the court saw that Direct Selling Entities work in a particular system which is managed and these substances have additionally given their endeavours to the Government to be limited by the Direct Selling Guidelines, in shopper interest. These agreements/rules, the court noted were totally advised to the litigants when offended parties found offer of their items on these stages. In any case, regardless of being advised, none of the web based business stages consented to bring down the offended parties' items. These stages never guaranteed that the agreements of the offended parties with their merchants are satisfied and their business trustworthiness is kept up. The Court saw that the misdeed of affectation of break of agreement and tortious obstruction with contracts is an all-around perceived misdeed and internet business stages were committed, after being so informed, to

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

guarantee that they don't initiate penetrate of agreements in any way. It was seen that these web based business stages were offering a shelter for parties breaking their agreements with the offended parties and this asylum itself comprises incitement. It was subsequently held that the litigants' exercises griped of brought about prompting of break of agreement and tortious impedance with authoritative connections of the offended parties with their merchants.

The court likewise allowed between time reliefs to the offended parties by entomb alia granting interval directives limiting the respondents/online business stages from showing, publicizing, selling, and encouraging repackaging of the offended parties' items, besides of those dealers who produce composed authorization/assent of the offended parties for posting their items. The court asked that during the pendency of the suit if the offended parties discover the presentation of their items by dealers without their assent, at that point on bring down notification being given the web based business stages will bring down such item postings inside a time of 36 hours.

The developing statute on intermediaries fundamentally impacts all online business players and requires them to proceed all the more circumspectly. The opportunity has arrived for online business organizations to act with a more prominent level of duty. This incorporates indicating more noteworthy affectability towards the intellectual property of the rights holders just as their other legitimate rights and commitments emerging out of the respective businesses.

Due Diligence laws in India's E-commerce:

The Central Government of India made certain rules or the guidelines regarding the liability of intermediaries and the rules may be called as the **Information Technology (Intermediaries guidelines) Rules, 2011**. The **Rule No. 3** of the Information Technology (Intermediaries guidelines) Rules, 2011[20] deals with the due diligence obligations which has to be observed by intermediaries and it states that it is the due diligence obligation of the intermediaries to ensure that there are no infringements of any patent, trademark, copyright and other subject matters of the intellectual property laws.

VI. CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS:

Many countries are facing the problems relating to the infringement of trademark in the e-commerce industries and trying to enact or amend the laws to prevent the infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce sphere. It is suggested that the ways to prevent the infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce sphere are by following all the laws relating to

[20]**Information Technology (Intermediaries guidelines) Rules, 2011.**

the due diligence obligation of the intermediaries of various countries. Before selling or advertising the goods in online, the e-commerce websites must manually verify the authenticity or the originality of the goods to prevent the infringement of the trademark and it is also an absolute legal duty of the e- commerce industries to perform the due diligence obligation for each and every time. When the due diligence obligations are strictly followed by the intermediaries or by the e-commerce websites, the blame will not fall on the artificial intelligence software and by following all the laws or rules relating to the due diligence obligations, the infringement of trademarks in the e-commerce sphere can be prevented to a greater extent.

*****

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

VII. REFERENCES

1. Michael Harbone, *The History & Evolution of Ecommerce*, PAY KICK START (Dec. 07, 2020, 10: 15 AM), https://paykickstart.com/the-history-and-evolution-of-commerce/. 456 **U.S.** at **853-54.**
2. Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc, 456 **U.S.** at **853-54 (1982).**
3. Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. eBay Inc, 600 F.3d 93 (2d Cir. 2010) (2010).
4. Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Akanoc Solutions, Inc, 658 F.3d 936 (9th Cir. 2011) (2011).
5. U.S. Dept of Homeland Security, *Combating the Trafficking in the Counterfeit and Pirated Goods - Report to the President of the United States*, U.S.A (Dec. 08, 2020, 02:00 PM), https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/20_0124_plcy_counterfeit-pirated-goods-report_01.pdf.
6. European Union, *27 Member Countries of EU* (Dec. 14, 2020, 10: 10 AM), https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en.
7. L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG, Case C-324/09, [2011] ECR I-6011 (CJEU July 12, 2011) (2011).
8. Louis Vuitton v Google France, C-236/08 to C-238/08 (2010).
9. The Coty vs Amazon case, *EU: C: 2020:26*, (2020).
10. Article 3, Directive 2004/48/EC.
11. L'Oréal SA v. eBay International AG, [2009] EWHC 1094 (Ch), [2009] RPC 21.
12. Cosmetic Warriors Ltd and Lush Ltd v Amazon.co.uk Ltd and Amazon EU Sarl [2014] EWHC 181 (Ch).
13. Interflora v Google, [2013] EWHC 1291 (Ch), [2013] WLR (D) 206.
14. The Regulation 20, The Electronic Commerce (The EC Directive) of Regulations 2002.
15. MySpace Inc. v. Super Cassettes Industries Ltd, 236 (2017) DLT 478 (2016).
16. Christian Louboutin SAS v. Nakul Bajaj and Ors, 2018(76) PTC 508(Del), (2018).
17. Amway India Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. v. 1Mg Technologies Pvt. Ltd. and Anr, CS (OS) 410/2018 (2018).

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]

18. **Kapil Wadhwa and Ors. Vs. Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Anr, 2013 (53) PTC 112 (Del.) (DB)** (2013).

19. Information Technology (Intermediaries guidelines) Rules, 2011.

*****

© 2020. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities [ISSN 2581-5369]