

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dabur India Limited v. 李策平 (li ce ping)

Case No. D2026-1896

1. The Parties

Complainant is Dabur India Limited, India, represented by Intl Advocare, India.

Respondent is 李策平 (li ce ping), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theodonil.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 1, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (Anonymous / Registration Private Through Domains by Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 11, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on May 17, 2026.

On May 11, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On May 17, 2026, Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. Respondent did not submit any comment on Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 Respondent in English and Chinese of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Yijun Tian as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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.

On July 1, 2026, the Panel issued the Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1 requiring Complainant to clarify its mutual jurisdiction selection by July 4, 2026, and inviting Respondent to comment on the Complainant's submission by July 7, 2026. Complainant filed a second amended Complaint on July 6, 2026.

4. Factual Background

A. Complainant

Complainant is a company incorporated in India. Founded in 1884, Complainant is one of India's leading consumer goods companies and one of the world's leading manufacturers of herbal and Ayurvedic products. For over 140 years, Complainant has manufactured and marketed a broad range of pharmaceuticals, personal care, home care, food and healthcare products. Its products are sold in more than 120 countries under a portfolio of brands, including DABUR, HAJMOLA, REAL, VATIKA, ODOMOS and ODONIL.

Complainant has rights in the ODONIL mark. The ODONIL mark has been extensively used in connection with air fresheners and related home care products since at least 1958. Complainant is the owner of numerous ODONIL trademarks, including the Indian trademark registered on May 11, 2020 (Registration No. 4499100) (Annex 9 to the Complaint).

Complainant also owns the domain names <odonil.com> (registered on January 24, 2014) and <odonil.in> (registered on January 28, 2014) (Annex 10 to the Complaint).

B. Respondent

Respondent is 李策平 (li ce ping), China.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 10, 2025. According to the Complaint and the evidence provided by Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering air fresheners and related home care products under the ODONIL mark. Respondent reproduces Complainant's ODONIL trademark and device mark and offers identical or similar products, creating the false impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ODONIL trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the ODONIL trademark in its entirety. The mere addition of the term "the" does not provide adequate distinction to negate the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark ODONIL.

Complainant contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

From the evidence presented on the record, no agreement appears to have been entered into between Complainant and Respondent to the effect that the language of the proceeding should be English. Complainant filed initially its Complaint and amended Complaint in English, and has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following main reasons:

- (a) The website associated with the disputed domain name is in English, indicating Respondent's familiarity with and capability in the English language.
- (b) The disputed domain name consists of English words and characters, suggesting that it targets English-speaking Internet users.
- (c) The website associated with the disputed domain name appears to target English-speaking consumers.
- (d) Requiring Complainant to translate the Complaint and supporting annexes into Chinese would impose unnecessary burden, expense and delay, contrary to the objective of the UDRP of providing an efficient and cost-effective dispute resolution mechanism.
- (e) Conducting the proceeding in English would not prejudice Respondent.

Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

On the record, Respondent appears to be located in China and thus presumably not a native English speaker, but considering the following aspects, the Panel has decided that the language of the proceeding shall be English: (a) the disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters, particularly English words (e.g., "the"), rather than Chinese script; (b) the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") of the disputed domain name is ".com", so the disputed domain name seems to be prepared for users worldwide, particularly in English-speaking countries; (c) the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage entirely in English (Annex 17 to the Complaint); (d) the Center has notified Respondent of the language of the proceeding in both Chinese and English, and Respondent did not comment on Complainant's request that English be the language of the proceeding; and (e) the Center also notified Respondent in both Chinese and English of the Complaint, and informed Respondent that it would accept a Response in either English or Chinese, but Respondent chose not to file any Response.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues: Three Elements

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds Complainant's ODONIL mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the term "the" may bear on the 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

More specifically:

(i) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Respondent has not provided evidence or reasons to justify the choice of the term "odonil", which is the same as Complainant's ODONIL trademark, in the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence to show that Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the ODONIL trademark or to register or use any domain name incorporating the ODONIL marks;

(ii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. There has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain name. Respondent registered the disputed domain name on November 10, 2025, after the ODONIL mark was registered in India. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's ODONIL marks; and

(iii) there has been no evidence adduced to show that Respondent was making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. By contrast, the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website offering air fresheners and related home care products under the ODONIL mark. Respondent deliberately imitates Complainant's official website by using identical images and replicating the overall website layout. Therefore, Respondent has attempted to make profits through the Internet traffic attracted to the website under the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Based on the information provided by Complainant, the Panel finds that Complainant has a reputation in the ODONIL marks with regard to its products and services. It is not conceivable that Respondent would not have had Complainant's trademark in mind at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name (on November 10, 2025). This finding has been reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant's ODONIL trademark entirely, and that the use of Complainant's trademark on the website under the disputed domain name.

Respondent has used the website to offer goods under the ODONIL mark. Additionally, Respondent deliberately imitates Complainant's official website by using identical images and replicating the overall website layout. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that Respondent is using a confusingly similar disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant. Such use constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <theodonil.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Yijun Tian/

Yijun Tian

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2026