

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Infosys Limited v. Anil Zaparde, Infosys Consulting, Inc.  
Case No. D2025-0445

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Infosys Limited, India, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Anil Zaparde, Infosys Consulting, Inc., United States of America (“United States”).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <infosysgroup.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2025. On February 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on March 5, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant was established in 1981. It is an NYSE-listed global consulting and IT services company with more than 346,000 employees, operating in more than 50 countries, and its total revenue for 2022 was USD 17.94 billion. The Complainant opened its first international office in Boston, Massachusetts, United States, in 1987, and its first European office in the United Kingdom in 1995. It operates its official website at the domain name <infosys.com>, registered on July 17, 1992.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for INFOSYS (the “INFOSYS trademark”), including the following registrations:

- the Indian trademark INFOSYS with registration No. 475267, registered on July 15, 1987, for computer hardware, computer interface computer peripherals, electronic telex interface, and all goods covered in International Class 9; and
- the United States trademark INFOSYS with registration No. 1809733, registered on December 7, 1993, for computer consultation services and custom design of computer software in International Class 42, with date of first use in commerce in September 1978.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 23, 1996. It is currently inactive. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a parking webpage.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, in at least 2002 and 2005 the disputed domain name resolved to the website of the Respondent’s company Infosys Consulting, Inc. The evidence submitted by the Complainant and confirmed by the information publicly available on the official website of the New York State Department of State also shows that the Respondent Anil Zaporde was the Chief Executive Officer of the company Infosys Consulting, Inc. with DOS ID 1480871, which was incorporated in the State of New York, the United States, on October 11, 1990 as Digitron Software Systems, Inc., changed its name to Infosys Consulting, Inc. on December 11, 1996, and was dissolved on October 26, 2011.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its INFOSYS trademark, because it incorporates this trademark with the addition of the dictionary word “group” which does not eliminate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark in any manner, including in domain names. The Complainant submits that its INFOSYS trademark had an already established reputation by the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 1996, well after the Complainant’s registration and first use of its trademark in commerce and after the registration of its <infosys.com> domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant’s INFOSYS trademark in its entirety with the addition of the dictionary word “group”, suggests an affiliation with or authorization by the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent cannot claim that he is commonly known by the disputed domain name because of his connection to the company Infosys Consulting, Inc. According to the Complainant, the Respondent could not acquire rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by simply incorporating the Complainant’s trademark into the name of his business entity, as otherwise the

purpose and intent of the Policy would be frustrated. In this regard, the Complainant points out that the Respondent adopted “Infosys” as the leading element in his company name years after the Complainant registered the INFOSYS trademark in India and in the United States, and used it in relation to activities that coincided and directly competed with the Complainant’s own services, i.e. IT consulting and contract services, thus creating an impression of affiliation with the Complainant and its business and misleadingly diverting the Complainant’s consumers. According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s company name was opportunistically chosen to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark and cannot support a claim to a right or legitimate interests under the Policy in favor of the Respondent. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name currently lacks content, which shows that the Respondent has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It submits that it has provided its goods and services using the INFOSYS trademark since 1981, as a result of which the INFOSYS trademark has become known internationally before the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, by registering the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and its <infosys.com> domain name and historically using it to operate a website under the name “Infosys Consulting, Inc.” while offering services in competition with the Complainant’s services, the Respondent has demonstrated familiarity with the Complainant’s brand and business. The Complainant asserts that it is not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant’s brands at the time the disputed domain name was registered. In this regard, the Complainant submits that it made its IPO (Initial Public Offering) in February 1993 and a private placement of shares in October 1994 to fund its capital programs, that in the financial year 1996-97, it had a total revenue of USD 40.9 million, and that a Google search for “infosys group” for the period January 1, 1990 to October 1, 1996 returns multiple links referencing the Complainant and its business.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark by using the disputed domain name to operate a website under the name of “Infosys Consulting, Inc.”, attempting to profit from such confusion by offering similar and competing services.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent has ignored the Complainant’s attempts to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceeding.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the INFOSYS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the INFOSYS trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the INFOSYS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “group”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the INFOSYS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name was registered in 1996, which is a long time ago, and a question naturally arises as to the likelihood that the Respondent could have been aware of the Complainant at that distant time and could have targeted it with the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant’s INFOSYS trademark was first registered in India in 1987, and its registration in the United States was granted in 1993. The Complainant opened its first international office in the United States in 1987 and its first European office in 1995, and registered its domain name <infosys.com> in 1992. The Complainant also submits that it made its first IPO in 1993 and that its revenue for 1996-97 was USD 40.9 million. As noted by the Complainant, the first results of a Google search for “infosys group” for the period January 1, 1990 to October 1, 1996 refer to it and its business. All this taken together leads the Panel to the conclusion that the Complainant and its INFOSYS trademark had indeed gained a certain level of popularity in its industry by 1996, when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Wayback Machine-archived copy from 2005 of the website at the disputed domain name shows that it presented the Respondent’s company (which was incorporated in 1990 under a different name, and adopted the name Infosys Consulting, Inc. only in December 1996). The website described this company as “a pioneering IT Consulting and Contract Services organization”, that “seamlessly integrates the newest applications and hardware into a wide variety of business environments.” These services largely coincide or overlap with the services provided by the Complainant and included in the scope of protection of its INFOSYS trademark. So by 1996 the Respondent had already operated for six years in the same industry as the Complainant, which increases the likelihood that the Respondent had been aware of the Complainant when the disputed domain name was registered. It also has some relevance in this regard that the Respondent’s names appear to be of Indian origin, and the Complainant is from India.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has not denied his knowledge of the Complainant or provided any plausible explanation as to how and why it chose to register the disputed domain name and to rename his company to include “Infosys” in it.

In view of all the above, and in the absence of any evidence or even allegation to the contrary, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its INFOSYS trademark when he registered the disputed domain name and renamed his company in 1996, and did this not independently of the Complainant, but targeting it in an attempt to develop his business by exploiting the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

As already discussed in the section on rights and legitimate interests above, the circumstances of this case support a conclusion that by 1996 the Complainant had already achieved a certain level of popularity in the IT consultancy business, including in the United States, where the Respondent is located, and the Respondent was in the same business. The Respondent, although duly informed of the proceeding, has not denied his knowledge of the Complainant and has not provided any plausible explanation for the reasons why in 1996 he decided to register the disputed domain name and to change the name of his (then-existing under a different name) company to include "Infosys" in it, considering that his intentions (evident from the content of his website) were to continue offering services that coincided with and therefore competed with the Complainant's services. All this, taken together, leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when he registered the disputed domain name and changed the name of his company to include "Infosys" in it, and that the Respondent did this targeting the Complainant's INFOSYS trademark, and supports a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

### **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <infosysgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Assen Alexiev/*

**Assen Alexiev**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 19, 2025