

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Inox Wind Limited v. RAVI KAPADIYA

Case No. D2025-2633

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Inox Wind Limited, India, represented by Saikrishna & Associates, India.

The Respondent is RAVI KAPADIYA, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <inoxsolarenergy.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 4, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (M/s Inox Solar Energy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Ashwinie Kumar Bansal as the sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 incorporated on April 9, 2009, under Indian law, is part of the InoxGFL Group, a conglomerate with a legacy of over 90 years in sectors including fluoropolymers, specialty chemicals, wind energy, and renewables. Leveraging its extensive global presence and distribution network, the Complainant has become one of the major wind energy solutions provider, catering to Independent Power Producers (IPPs), utilities, public sector undertakings, corporates, and retail investors. It manufactures components of Wind Turbine Generators (WTGs), delivering high-quality, technologically advanced, reliable, and cost-effective products.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations, including Indian trademark registration number 2539210 for INOXWIND registered on May 28, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2017. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used to offer competing services bearing the name “inox”.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on February 5, 2025, and received a response indicating that it started the procedure of changing the name and logo of its firm.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that it has fulfilled all requirements under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name. The Complainant was duly incorporated on April 9, 2009, and is the registered proprietor and authorized user of the Trademarks INOX and INOX WIND. Since 2009, the Complainant has continuously and extensively used the Trademark INOX WIND in relation to renewable energy goods and services, building on the established goodwill of the core INOX Trademark, which has been in uninterrupted commercial use since 1963. Together, these trademarks represent over six decades of reputation and more than fifteen years of sector-specific brand recognition and are firmly entrenched in the minds of consumers and the trade.

The Complainant contends that the INOX Trademark is inherently distinctive and wholly arbitrary in the context of renewable energy services. This arbitrariness enhances its capacity as a unique and exclusive source-identifier of the Complainant's business. Through decades of consistent, large-scale use, the Complainant has accrued substantial goodwill, reputation, and consumer association with the INOX and INOX WIND Trademarks. Accordingly, any third-party adoption of “Inox” within the renewable energy sector cannot be coincidental, but rather an intentional attempt to exploit the Complainant's reputation and market standing.

The disputed domain name <inoxsolarenergy.com> wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive INOX Trademark as its dominant element. The mere addition of descriptive or generic terms such as “solar” or “energy” does not mitigate the confusion but instead reinforces the association with the Complainant, as these terms directly relate to the Complainant's field of business. The disputed domain name gives the misleading impression of affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement by the Complainant. The visual and phonetic similarity is so pronounced that consumers are likely to be deceived into believing that the Respondent's disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant's established brand.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of disrupting the Complainant's business and unfairly capitalizing on its goodwill. By adopting a domain name identical or confusingly similar to that of the Trademark INOX of the Complainant for identical services in the renewable energy sector, the Respondent has sought to divert business, misappropriate commercial advantage, and free-ride on the reputation of the Complainant's well-known Trademark. The likelihood of confusion is aggravated because the Respondent operates in the same

industry, thereby causing consumers to presume that its services are endorsed or authorized by the Complainant.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name <inoxsolarenergy.com>. At no point has the Respondent been licensed, authorized, or permitted to use the INOX mark, nor does any contractual or business relationship exist between the Parties. The Respondent's mala fide intent is further demonstrated by its explicit acknowledgment of the Complainant's rights and admission of infringement in its letters, wherein it undertook to discontinue use of the disputed domain but failed to do so. The Respondent's conduct reveals that its sole objective is to exploit the Complainant's goodwill for commercial benefit.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's established Trademark. Even a simple trademark or Internet search for "INOX renewable energy" would have disclosed the Complainant's long-standing rights and reputation. The Respondent's registration of an identical disputed domain name for identical services, despite such easily discoverable information, and its continued bad faith use despite express undertakings to cease infringement, clearly evidences bad faith under the Policy.

The Complainant pleads that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As per paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, where a respondent does not submit a substantive response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstances in this case preventing it from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondent to file a substantive response. As per paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel is to draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate.

The Complainant is required to make out its case in all respects under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, which sets out the three elements that must be present for the proceeding to be brought against the Respondent, which the Complainant must prove to obtain a requested remedy. It provides as follows:

"4(a). Applicable Disputes: You are required to submit to a mandatory administrative proceeding in the event that a third party (a "complainant") asserts to the applicable Provider, in compliance with the Rules of Procedure, that:

(i) your domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) you have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(iii) your domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In the administrative proceeding, the complainant must prove that each of these three elements are present."

The Panel will address all three aspects of the Policy listed above hereunder:

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has provided evidence showing that it has rights in the Trademark INOX WIND through its registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the dominant part of the Trademark INOX WIND of the Complainant. The WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7 provides the consensus view of panelists: “While each case is judged on its own merits, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant trademark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of UDRP standing.”

The mere addition of the suffixes “solar” and “energy” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s Trademark INOX WIND. The Panel considers it useful to refer to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements”.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy that there is a confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s Trademark INOX WIND.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complaint is founded on the Complainant’s well-established rights in the INOX WIND Trademark and its continuous use across a wide range of goods and services in the renewable energy sector. The Complainant has extensively used the INOX WIND Trademarks since 2009 through its operations in wind energy solutions and the manufacture of critical components for Wind Turbine Generators. Over decades of consistent and bona fide use, the term “inox” has acquired inherent distinctiveness and has become associated with the Complainant’s business, reputation, and leadership in the wind energy industry.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances, but without limitation, which, if found by the Panel to be proved, may demonstrate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is in no way related to the Complainant; neither is the Respondent an agent of the Complainant, nor does it in any way or manner carry out activities for or on behalf of the Complainant. The Complainant’s rights have been reinforced through subsequent statutory registrations of the INOX WIND Trademarks and their continuous and bona fide commercial use since 2009 in connection with renewable energy goods and services.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1 states that: “While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Respondent has failed to file a Response to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case or to explain its rights or legitimate interests. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has any trademark

rights associated with the disputed domain name or has actually been commonly known by the disputed domain name, apart from registration of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as per paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise. Moreover, the Respondent itself has admitted to this lack of entitlement: in its letter dated February 10, 2025, it expressly undertook to cease using the mark, and in a subsequent letter of March 26, 2025, its partners confirmed removal of the infringing logo from social media and the website, further committing to change the disputed domain name. These admissions constitute clear and conclusive evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Considering the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied its burden to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel is satisfied that the second element of the Policy has been met.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy identifies, in particular but without limitation, four circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be the evidence of the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant is required to prove both that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith. Hence, circumstances at the time of registration and thereafter have to be considered by the Panel.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states: “Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark.”

The Complainant’s Trademark INOX WIND has acquired significant uniqueness and repute due to its long and continuous usage by the Complainant. Noting, inter alia, the well-known nature of the Complainant’s Trademark INOX WIND and the well-established reputation and goodwill associated with it, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Trademark INOX WIND.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website offering competing renewable energy services associated with the Complainant. Considering the Complainant’s fame in India where the Respondent is located, the Panel considers that the Respondent’s use is potentially for commercial gain, and the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Respondent did not come forward with any argument or evidence to the contrary. The Panel finds the registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the third and last condition provided for by paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is met. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

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 <inoxsolarenergy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ashwinie Kumar Bansal/

Ashwinie Kumar Bansal

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2025