



सत्यमेव जयते

INDIA NON JUDICIAL

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi

e-Stamp

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Certificate No. | : IN-DL51931156092136T |
| Certificate Issued Date | : 18-Nov-2021 02:40 PM |
| Account Reference | : IMPACC (SH)/ dlshimp17/ HIGH COURT/ DL-DLH |
| Unique Doc. Reference | : SUBIN-DLDLSHIMP1797082374614885T |
| Purchased by | : ALOK KUMAR JAIN |
| Description of Document | : Article 12 Award |
| Property Description | : Not Applicable |
| Consideration Price (Rs.) | : 0 (Zero) |
| First Party | : ALOK KUMAR JAIN |
| Second Party | : Not Applicable |
| Stamp Duty Paid By | : ALOK KUMAR JAIN |
| Stamp Duty Amount(Rs.) | : 100 (One Hundred only) |



Please write or type below this line

BEFORE ALOK KUMAR JAIN, SOLE ARBITRATOR
INDRP Case No. 1449

Disputed Domain Name: www.willpharma.in

ARBITRATION AWARD

WILL PHARMA BV,
Versus
NAVNEET MALHOTRA,

Complainant

Respondent

Alok Kumar Jain

Page 1 of 30

Statutory Alert:

- 1 The authenticity of this Stamp certificate should be verified at 'www.shcilestamp.com' or using e-Stamp Mobile App of Stock Holding. Any discrepancy in the details on this Certificate and as available on the website / Mobile App renders it invalid.
- 2 The onus of checking the legitimacy is on the users of the certificate.
- 3 In case of any discrepancy please inform the Competent Authority.

BEFORE ALOK KUMAR JAIN, SOLE ARBITRATOR

.IN REGISTRY

NATIONAL INTERNET EXCHANGE OF INDIA(NIXI)

INDRP ARBITRATION

INDRP Case No. 1449

Disputed Domain Name: www.willpharma.in

ARBITRATION AWARD

Dated 20.11.2021

IN THE MATTER OF:

Will Pharma BV,
Wilgenlaan 5
1161 JK Zwanenberg
Netherlands

..Complainant

Versus

Navneet Malhotra
RZ Delhi
Naee Dilee
Delhi-110047
India

...Respondent

1. The Parties

The Complainant in this arbitration proceeding is **Will Pharma BV**, with its office at Wilgenlaan 5, 1161 JK Zwanenberg,

Alok Kumar Jain
Page 2 of 30

Netherlands. The Complainant is represented by Ms. Malavika T. Vikram Of M/s. DePenning & DePenning (Patents, Trade Marks, Designs, Copyright)with its office at 120 Velachery Main Road, Guindy, Chennai - 600 032 ,INDIA,Phone: +91 44 4221 3444,Fax: +91 44 4221 3402 with Email: domain@depenning.com

- 1.1 The Respondent is Navneet Malhotra,Postal address as RZ-Delhi. Naee Dillee, Delhi 110047, India with Mobile no.+91 9654333938 and Email Address as 'nikitgarg@outlook.com'

2 Domain Name and Registrar:-

- 2.1 The Disputed Domain name is <www.willpharma.in> which was registered on 6th December 2020.

The accredited Registrar with whom the Disputed Domain Name is registered is Godaddy.com LLC ,Corporate Headquarters 14452 IN Hayden Road,Scottsdale AZ 85260,USA,Telephone Number: +1 4805058877,Email:UDRPdisputes@godaddy.com

3 Procedure History:

- 3.1. This arbitration proceeding is in accordance with the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy")

Alok Kumar Jain

adopted by the National Internet Exchange of India ("NIXI") and the INDRP Rules of Procedure (the "Rules") which were approved in accordance with the Indian Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. By registering the Disputed Domain Name with a NIXI accredited Registrar, the Respondent agreed to the resolution of disputes pursuant to the said Policy and the Rules.

As per the information received from NIXI, the history of the proceedings is as follows:

- 3.2. The Complaint was filed by the Complainant with NIXI against the Respondent . On 29.10.2021 I was appointed as Sole Arbitrator to decide the disputes between the parties. I submitted statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence same day as required by rules to ensure compliance with Paragraph 6 of the Rules.

NIXI notified the Parties of my appointment as Arbitrator *via* email dated 29.10.2021 and served by email an electronic Copy of the Complainant with Annexures on the Respondent

Alok Kumar Jain

at the email addresses of the Respondent as provided in whois.com.

3.3. I issued notice to the Respondent vide email dated 30.10.2021 directing the Complainant to serve complete set of Complaint on the Respondent in soft copies as well as in physical via courier /Post. The Respondent was directed to file its response within 7 days from the date of notice. The Respondent was duly served at the Email address at 'nikitgarg@gmail.com' furnished by the Respondent with the registrar at the time of obtaining the disputed domain name as given in WHOIS details. However the Respondent did not file any reply. In response one Mr. Nikit Garg replied on 30.10.2021 vide said email given in 'WHOIS.COM' as the email address of the Respondent. Mr. Nikit Garg stated in its reply email that he has no concern with present case. And that his details have been been wrongly presented in the case. He has also furnished an email address as 'navmalhotran@gmail.com' stating it to be email address of

Alok Kumar Jain

the Respondent. Be that as it may. The respondent was bound by the email address given in 'WHOIS' details on which the Respondent has been duly served. Since no reply was filed by the respondent Therefore, on 06.11.2021 I granted further time to Respondent directing the Respondent to file response within 8 days failing which the matter shall be decided on merit. Copy of the said directions were also sent to the Respondent additionally at the new email address of the Respondent as furnished by Mr.Nikit Garg.However the emails sent to the respondent at the email address at 'navmalhotran@gmail.com'as furnished by Mr.Nikit Garg was returned undelivered. The extra time given to the Respondent expired on 15.11.2021.No reply was received from the Respondent. On 16.11.2021 I informed the parties that the time for filing reply has expired and now the complaint shall be decided on merit. No personal hearing was requested.

Alok Kumar Jain

3.4. Clause 8(b) of the INDRP Rules requires that the Arbitrator shall at all times treat the Parties with equality and provide each one of them with a fair opportunity to present their case.

3.5. Clause 12 of INDRP Rules provides that in the event any party breaches the provisions of INDRP rules and/or directions of the Arbitrator, the matter can be decided ex-parte by the Arbitrator and such arbitral award shall be binding in accordance to law.

3.6 As stated above, Respondent failed to file any Response to the Complaint despite two opportunities and chose not to answer the Complainant's assertions or controvert the Complaint and the contentions raised. As a result, I find that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his case but has chosen not to come forward and defend itself.

3.7 Further Clause 13(a) of the Rules provides that an Arbitrator shall decide a Complaint on the basis of the pleadings submitted and in accordance with the Arbitration &

Alok Kumar Jain

Conciliation Act, 1996 amended as per the Arbitration and Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 2015 read with the Arbitration & Conciliation Rules, Dispute Resolution Policy, the Rules of Procedure and any by-laws, and guidelines and any law that the Arbitrator deems to be applicable, as amended from time to time.

In these circumstances the Tribunal proceeds to decide the complaint on merit in accordance with said Act, Policy and Rules on Respondent's failure to submit a response despite having been given sufficient opportunity and time to do so.

4. Grounds for Arbitration Proceedings.

INDRP Policy para 4. Class of Disputes provides as under:

Any Person who considers that a registered domain name conflicts with his/her legitimate rights or interests may file a Complaint to the .IN Registry on the following premises:

(a) the Registrant's domain name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

Alok Kumar Jain

(b) the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(c) the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

5. The Case of the Complainant :-

The Complainant submits that the dispute falls properly within the scope of the .IN Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (INDRP) and the Administrative Panel has the jurisdiction to decide the dispute for the following reasons:

a. That the domain name in question is identical to the Complainant's well known trade mark **WILLPHARMA**, derived from the name of the founder Ludwig Frederick Will.

b. That **WILLPHARMA** also forms a dominant part of the Complainant's corporate name since the year 1924.

c. That the Respondent has no claims, rights or legitimate interests in respect of disputed domain name;

d. That the domain name '**www.willpharma.in**' has been registered in bad faith;

Alok Kumar Jain

e. That the Complainant has obtained registration for registration of the trade mark **WILLPHARMA** in several countries;

f. That the Complainant also owns and controls domain names such as www.willpharma.com and www.willpharma.nl.

g. That the Complainant has generated good and valuable reputation and a significant amount of goodwill has accrued to the Complainant in the name of **WILLPHARMA** through internet over several years;

h. That the Respondent has adopted and registered the disputed domain name, which is identical to the trade mark and corporate name of the Complainant, thereby wrongfully, illegally and dishonestly trading upon the reputation of the Complainant.

i. The Respondent is not making any legitimate use of the impugned domain name.

The Complainant has invoked clause 4 of the Policy and has prayed for transfer of the disputed domain in their favour.

- 5.1 Complainant further states that the Complainant specializes in developing, manufacturing and marketing health products, health care and digital healthcare applications and is known for producing innovating and natural products. The Complainant's well-known brands and

Alok Kumar Jain

products include **TEMPOCOL** peppermint oil capsules, **AFFUSINE** for treatment of skin infection caused by bacteria, **COMBIZYM G** to support digestion. The Complainant's health care business was built on their ability to understand customer needs and meet them with effective products/ solutions.

5.2 That the Complainant has operations that began in Europe and UK, and have fast growing market presence in the Middle East, Asia - Pacific, South America and African markets. The Complainant's have further developed their business by out-licensing products developed through export partnerships, and by in licensing value-added products. The official website of the complainant is www.willpharma.com. The Complainant has amassed sound partner networks in the health care market, including commercial and public entities. The Complainant has a social media presence that can be well witnessed in platforms like "LINKEDIN", "FACEBOOK" and "INSTAGRAM".

5.3 That the word '**WILLPHARMA**' is the dominant and essential feature of the complainant's corporate name which indicates distinctiveness, reputation, quality and goodwill acquired and established across several countries around the world. It is stated that the use of the keyword **WILLPHARMA** in any leading search engine

Alok Kumar Jain

throws up the web pages of the Complainant among the leading hits. Printout of the search result procured from the famous search engine google.com is annexed hereto and collectively marked as '**Annexure-C**'.

- 5.4 That the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. And that the trade mark **WILLPHARMA** has acquired both statutory right and Common Law right, the complainant relies on the Foreign Trade Mark registrations for the purpose of the instant complaint as shown in the trade mark registration certificates marked as '**Annexure D**' with the Complaint. It is further averred that the Respondent has no right to or legitimate interest in the domain name www.willpharma.in. The Respondent illegally and wrongfully adopted the trade mark **WILLPHARMA** of the Complainant with the intention to create an impression of an association with the Complainant. That the respondent wrongfully and fraudulently adopted and registered the impugned domain name www.willpharma.in in order to utilize the name and reputation without having any rights thereto and in spite of having full knowledge of the Complainant's iconic stature in India and Internationally.

- 5.5 The Complainant submits that the respondent is trying to cash in on the goodwill and reputation associated with the

Alok Kumar Jain

trade mark **WILLPHARMA**, although the respondent has no connection with the Complainant **WILLPHARMA BV**. It is further stated that the Complainant and/or any entity belonging to the **WILLPHARMA BV**, has not licensed or otherwise permitted the respondent to use **WILLPHARMA** nor has it permitted the Respondent to apply for or use any 'Domain Name' incorporating the mark **WILLPHARMA**.

- 5.6 The disputed domain name clearly incorporates the Complainant's trade mark **WILLPHARMA** in the entirety. Such use of the disputed domain name is considered evidence of bad faith registration and use under the **INDRP**. In this regard the Complainant relies on the decision passed in the case of **INDRP/642 MOZILLA FOUNDATION Vs Mr. CHANDAN** www.mozilla.in marked as '**Annexure E**' The disputed domain name will give unwary visitors to the domain an impression that the disputed domain name has been authorized by the Complainant. It is pertinent to mention that the Complainant has no connection with the disputed domain name holder and the Complainant has never permitted the respondent to create the disputed domain name. A true and correct copy of the domain name dispute Rules

Alok Kumar Jain

and Policy that is applicable to the domain name in question is provided as '**Annexure F**' to this complaint.

5.7 Complainant further states that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. And that the Respondent has been offering employment on various on-line employment websites misrepresenting an association with the Complainant and mis-communicating that the Complainant has an active place of business in Bhubaneswar and Mumbai. Further, the Respondent has called for Resumes' of interested candidates to be sent to Rajatdas@willpharma.in. The mentioned facts show an dishonest and unscrupulous motive to make illegal profit. The Complainant is apprehensive that the respondent's conduct apart from infringing their trade mark rights would also cause dilution of brand value built over the years. **Annexure H**, is the snap shot from an on-line employment portal.

5.8 That the use and existence of the impugned domain name will cause damage and injury both to the Complainant's business, their reputation and to the consumers and general public. The respondent has attempted to make a deliberate misrepresentation to the public at large and it certainly cannot be a matter of mere coincidence. The misrepresentation is bound to cause confusion and deception in the minds of the purchasing public. It is stated

Alok Kumar Jain

that the registration of the impugned Domain Name by the respondent was made in bad faith. It is furthermore stated that it is undoubtedly the dishonest motive of the respondent to register such domain name comprising of popular and reputed Trade Marks to clandestinely negotiate for the transfer of the same for consideration. That furthermore it is stated that the domain name www.willpharma.in is so obviously connected with such a trade mark 'WILLPHARMA' belonging to the Complainant, that the very use by someone with no connection with the Complainant suggests opportunistic bad faith.

- 5.9 The Complainant has prayed inter alia for transfer of domain name in its favour.

6 Discussions and findings:

The Complainant has invoked Clause 4 of the Policy to initiate the Arbitration Proceeding.

Clause 4 of the INDRP Policy provides as under:

4. Class of disputes:

Any Person who considers that a registered domain name conflicts with his/her legitimate rights or interests may file a Complaint to the .IN Registry on the following premises:

Alok Kumar Jain

- (a) the Registrant's domain name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (b) the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (c) the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Therefore in order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant has to satisfy inter alia all the three conditions provided in clauses 4(a), 4(b) and 4(c) quoted above.

6.1 Condition 4(a):) the Registrant's domain name is identical and/or confusingly similar to a name, trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

6.1.1 The Complaint submitted that the disputed domain name in question is identical to the Complainant's well known trade mark **WILLPHARMA**, derived from the name of the founder Ludwig Frederick Will. And that **WILLPHARMA** also forms a dominant part of the complainant's corporate name since the year 1924.

Alok Kumar Jain
Page 16 of 30

It is further stated in the complaint that the Complainant has obtained registration for registration of the trade mark **WILLPHARMA** in several countries and that the Complainant also owns and controls domain names such as www.willpharma.com and www.willpharma.nl. That the Complainant has generated good and valuable reputation and a significant amount of goodwill has accrued to the Complainant in the name of **WILLPHARMA** through internet over several years;

6.1.2 It is further stated that the Complainant has a social media presence that can be well witnessed in platforms like "LINKEDIN", "FACEBOOK" and "INSTAGRAM". The word 'WILLPHARMA' is the dominant and essential feature of the complainant's corporate name which indicates distinctiveness, reputation, quality and goodwill acquired and established across several countries around the world. It is stated that the use of the keyword **WILLPHARMA** in any leading search engine throws up the web pages of the

Alok Kumar Jain
Page 17 of 30

Complainant among the leading hits. Printout of the search result procured from the famous search engine google.com is annexed with the complaint as **'Annexure-C'**.

The Respondent has not filed any response to the complaint as such all the averments of the complainant have remained un rebutted.

It is evident from above submissions and documents annexed with the complaint that the complainant has sufficiently established its rights in and to the ownership of the **'WILLPAHRMA'** Trademarks.

A mere perusal of the disputed domain name 'willpharma.in' of the Registrant/Respondent shows that the Respondent has used the Complainant's trading mark **'WILLPHARMA'** in its entirety. it is well established that the mere addition of the Country Code Top Level Domain '.in' does not add any distinctive or distinguishing element.

In this regard following cases may be referred:

Alok Kumar Jain

A. Incase Designs Corp v. Stavros Fernandes (INDRP/ 1209)
wherein the Learned Arbitrator observed that it is well established that the mere addition of the Country Code Top Level Domain '.in' does not add any distinctive or distinguishing element. In view of the same the Learned Arbitrator adjudged that the domain name *www.incase.in* of the respondent was identical to the trade mark *INCASE* of the Complainant.

B. The Gillette Company v. Mr Gaurav Kana (INDRJI/049)
wherein the disputed domain name was *www.gillete.in* and the complainant was the proprietor of the trademark and trading name *GILLETTE*. The Learned Arbitrator in the matter observed that:

"The Complainant has been using the trade name *GILLETTE* in many countries including the United States. As such, consumers looking for *GILLETTE* may instead reach the Respondent's website. Therefore I hold that the domain name *www.gillette.in* is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark."

C. In Lockheed Martin Corporation Vs. Aslam Nadia (INDRP Case No. 947) which held that when the disputed name

Apok Kanan Jena

contains the entirety of the Complainant's trade mark followed by a generic term, the addition of the top-level domain .in will not distinguish the Respondent's disputed domain name. In *Ducati Motor Holding S.p.A vs. Abhishek Chordia* (INDRP case No. 834) it was held that a domain name that entirely incorporates a Complainant's mark is sufficient to establish the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the mark

In view of the above I hold that the Disputed Domain Name 'www.willpharma.in' of the Registrant is Confusingly similar to the trademark WILLPHARMA of the Complainant.

6.2 **Condition no.4 (b) the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name;**

The Complainant submit that trade mark **WILLPHARMA** acquired both statutory right and Common Law right. The complainant relies on the Foreign Trade Mark registrations annexed with the Complaint as Annexure - D. It is stated that the Respondent has no right to or legitimate interest in the domain name www.willpharma.in. The Respondent illegally and wrongfully adopted the trade mark **WILLPHARMA** of the

Alok Kumar Jain

Complainant with the intention to create an impression of an association with the Complainant and to utilize the name and reputation without having any rights thereto and in spite of having full knowledge of the Complainant's iconic stature in India and Internationally. That the respondent is trying to cash in on the goodwill and reputation associated with the trade mark **WILLPHARMA**, although the respondent has no connection with the Complainant **WILLPHARMA BV**.

It is further stated that the Complainant and/or any entity belonging to the **WILLPHARMA BV**, has not licensed or otherwise permitted the respondent to use **WILLPHARMA** nor has it permitted the Respondent to apply for or use any 'Domain Name' incorporating the mark **WILLPHARMA**. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name clearly incorporates the Complainant's trade mark **WILLPHARMA** in the entirety. Such use of the disputed domain name is considered evidence of bad faith registration and use under the **INDRP**. In this regard the Complainant relies on the decision passed in the case of **INDRP/642 MOZILLA FOUNDATION Vs Mr. CHANDAN www.mozilla.in** marked as 'Annexure E'.

On perusal of the complaint and the documents annexed with the Complaint, I find that the Complainant has proved

Alok Kumar Jain

and established its extensive rights in the trademark 'WILLPHARMA'. The Registrant has no basis, reason or justification for having adopted a substantially identical disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Registrant to use its trading name or trademark or to apply for or use the domain name incorporating said name.

The Respondent has not filed any response as such the facts stated in the complaint had remained un rebutted. Further the Respondent has failed to satisfy the conditions contained in clause 6(a),(b) and 6(c) of INDRP Policy.

On the contrary the Complainant has established that the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interest in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Registrant's use of the Disputed Domain Name is with the intention to create an impression of an association with the Complainant and to utilize the name and reputation without having any rights thereto and in spite of having full knowledge of the Complainant's iconic stature in India and Internationally. The respondent is trying to cash in on the goodwill and reputation associated with the trade mark **WILLPHARMA**.

Alok Kumar Jain

I find that the Respondent has never been commonly identified with the disputed domain name or any variation thereof prior to Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name.

It is pertinent to note that the Respondent has no connection with the Complainant, or any company licensed by the Complainant. Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or the Trade Mark 'adobe'. Further, Respondent was not and is not authorized by Complainant to register, hold or use the disputed domain name.

In Red Bull GmbH v. Harold Gutch WIPO case No. D2000-0766 it was held by the Panel that "The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating any of those marks. Combination of the words "Red" and "Bull" is a purely fanciful combination of words, as there does not exist a red colored bull. Therefore, no trader would legitimately choose this mark unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant.

Alok Kurnan Jain

Accordingly, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name."

Therefore, in view of above and the submissions made in the complaint and on perusal of the accompanying documents , I am of the opinion that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly I hold that the Registrant has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

6.3

Condition 4(C): the Registrant's domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith

Clause 7 of INDRP Policy provides as under:

Clause 7. Evidence of Registration and use of Domain Name in Bad Faith

For the purposes of Clause 4(c), the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Arbitrator to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

Alok Kumar Jain

(a) circumstances indicating that the Registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant, who bears the name or is the owner of the trademark or service mark, or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(b) the Registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the Registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(c) by using the domain name, the Registrant has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the Registrant's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's name or mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Registrant's

Alok Kumar Jain

website or location or of a product or service on the Registrant's website or location.

It is shown by the complainant that the Complainant is a well known reputed and global entity with extensive operations around the world . The Registrant was most certainly aware of the repute and goodwill of the Complainant. Therefore adoption of the substantially identical Disputed Domain Name by the Registrant in 2020 is with the sole intention to trade upon and derive unlawful benefits from the goodwill accruing to the Complainant. The Registrant has in fact knowingly adopted the Disputed Domain Name which wholly -contains the Complainant's prior trademark WILLPAHRMA to attract customers to the Disputed Domain Name by creating confusion with the Complainant's reputed trademark WILLPHARMA and corresponding domain name.

The Complainant submits that the bad faith of the Registrant is further evident from the fact that the Respondent has been offering employment on various on-line employment websites misrepresenting an association with the

Alok Kumar Jain

Complainant and mis-communicating that the Complainant has an active place of business in Bhubaneswar and Mumbai. Further, the Respondent has called for Resumes' of interested candidates to be sent to Rajatdas@willpharma.in. The mentioned facts shows dishonest and unscrupulous motive to make illegal profit. The Complainant is apprehensive that the respondent's conduct apart from infringing their trade mark rights would also cause dilution of brand value built over the years. Snap shot from an on-line employment portal is annexed with the complaint as Annexure H.

It is already held that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trade mark 'WILLPHARMA', in which the Respondent is held to have no rights or legitimate interest.

It is clear from the fact that Respondent had registered the disputed domain name for sole purpose of designing the website to mislead consumers. By doing so the Respondent has intentionally attempted to create a likelihood of confusion with

Alok Kumar Jain

the Complainant's registered trade mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

The well-known status of the trade mark 'WILLPHARMA', which was adopted and applied by the Complainant well prior to the registration of the disputed domain, makes it extremely unlikely that Respondent created the disputed domain name independently without any knowledge of the Complainant's trade mark. It has been consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trade mark by an unaffiliated entity can itself create a presumption of bad faith.

In the case of *Motorola, Inc. v. NewGate Internet, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D20000079 where it was held that the use of somebody else 's trademark as a domain name (or even as a meta-tag) clearly does not constitute a "bona fide" offering of goods or services when the web site owner has no registered or common law rights to the mark, since the only reason to use the trademark as a domain name or meta-tag is to attract customers

Alok Kumar Jain

who . were looking for the products or services associated with the trademark. Such use of a trademark can create customer confusion or dilution of the mark, which is precisely what trademark laws are meant to prevent. And actions that create, or tend to create, violations of the law can hardly be considered to be "bona fide ".Further in the case of "In Yahoo! Inc. vs AkashArora & Anr (1999 PTC (19) 210 Delhi), wherein it was held that defendant's domain name could be perceived as being another domain of the plaintiff. In Colgate Pabnolive (India) Ltd. vs. Zhaxia INDRP/887 where it was observed that by registering the impugned domain name, the Respondent has attempted to attract internet users by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark/source of origin."

In view of above facts, and circumstances, submissions of the Complainant and on perusal of the documents annexed with the Complaint, I find that the Complaint has proved the circumstances referred in Clause 7(a)(b) and (c) of INDRP policy and has established that the registration of disputed domain name is in bad faith.

Alok Kumar Jain

Accordingly I hold that the Registrant's Domain Name has been registered in bad faith.

7

Decision:

7.1. In view of the foregoing, I hold that the Disputed Domain Name is identical and or confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known 'WILLPHARMA' Trademarks and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith.

In accordance with the INDRP Policy and Rules, I direct that the Disputed Domain Name registration be transferred to the Complainant,

7.2. In the facts and circumstances, as discussed above, I deem it appropriate to order the Respondent to pay cost of Rs.50,000/- for present proceedings to the Complainant.

Delhi
Dated 20.11.2021

Alok Kumar Jain

Alok Kumar Jain
Sole Arbitrator