ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Frederick Tonya, syngentar
Case No. D2026-0804

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Switzerland, internally represented.

The Respondent is Frederick Tonya, syngentar, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngentar.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 25, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 25, 2026, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 26, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 26, 2026.

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 February 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on March 24, 2026. 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a large multinational science-based agriculture company. It is headquartered in Switzerland. The Complainant has more than 30,000 employees in over 90 countries. Its products include agrochemicals for crop protection as well as vegetable and flower seeds.

The Complainant owns many registrations worldwide for trademarks which include the word element SYNGENTA, including the International Registration SYNGENTA, with registration number 732663 and a registration date of March 8, 2000, registered for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, designating various countries worldwide.

The Complainant also owns and operates multiple domain names incorporating its trademark, including <syngenta.com>, which is used for its official global website.

The disputed domain name was registered December 8, 2025, and resolves to a parked page.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following.

The disputed domain name has an obvious and deliberate typographical variation of the Complainant's well-known SYNGENTA trademark. The addition of the letter "r" at the end of the element "syngenta", does not substantially alter the overall appearance or commercial impression of the trademark. To the contrary, the typo is visually subtle and is likely to go unnoticed by Internet users, making the disputed domain name virtually indistinguishable from the domain name used by the Complainant for its global website.

The Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant, nor is the Respondent authorized to use the Complainant's trademark.

Although the disputed domain name resolves to a holding page, this does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

The disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant had registered its trademark and established an online presence.

In addition, MX records have been activated in connection with the disputed domain name. This potentially poses a serious risk that the Respondent may use the disputed domain dame to send fraudulent emails to customers, service providers, the Complainant's employees, or suppliers while impersonating the Complainant.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Only the letter "r" was added to the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The Panel finds that disputed domain name may be perceived as a misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1, 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 Panel is persuaded that the disputed domain name inherently and falsely represents that it is controlled by the Complainant. The letters "syngenta" in the disputed domain name are most likely to be understood as referring to the Complainant's marks and business. Therefore, certainly lacking a Response, finds that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name for illegitimate purposes, also in light of the fact that the Respondent activated MX records for the disputed domain names. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity like impersonation and fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have registered the disputed domain name to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a parked page, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel 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 <syngentar.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/
Willem J. H. Leppink
Sole Panelist
Date: March 26, 2026