

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Synopsys, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2024-4832

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Synopsys, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <synopsvs.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 22, 2024. On November 22, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 22, 2024, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 25, 2024, 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 amended Complaint on November 29, 2024.

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

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 December 2, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 23, 2024.

The Center appointed R. Eric Gaum as the sole panelist in this matter on January 17, 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 owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark SYNOPSYS, listed below:

Trademark	Jurisdiction	Status	Reg./App. No.
SYNOPSYS	Australia	Registered: July 22, 1993	607361
SYNOPSYS	Canada	Registered: June 7, 1996	TMA458822
SYNOPSYS	European Union	Registered: February 1, 1999	000181172
SYNOPSYS	India	Registered: August 12, 1993	603839
SYNOPSYS	Israel	Registered: February 5, 2013	240586
SYNOPSYS	Mexico	Registered: August 26, 1999	619107
SYNOPSYS	New Zealand	Registered: May 25, 2012	849059
SYNOPSYS	Singapore	Registered: July 20, 1993	T9305475E
SYNOPSYS	Switzerland	Registered: September 7, 2012	633883
SYNOPSYS	United States	Registered: June 12, 1990	1601521
SYNOPSYS	United States	Registered: October 23, 1990	1618482

The Complainant also owns and operates a number of domains including the domain name <synopsys.com> registered in 1989.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 3, 2024. According to the unrebutted evidence, the disputed domain name was used to send fraudulent emails as part of a phishing employment scheme.

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 been used by the Respondent in connection with a phishing employment scheme. More specifically, the disputed domain name was used to create the email address “[...]@synopsys.com”, which was in turn used to send emails impersonating the Complainant, reaching out to a potential candidate purporting to offer an interview for a fictitious graphic design position.

Prior to the filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a registrar parking page which included pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

The disputed domain name comprises a misspelling of the Complainant's SYNOPSIS trademark, altered only by the replacement of the second occurrence of the letter "y" by the letter "v", creating a high degree of visual similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not granted any authorization for the Respondent to make use of its SYNOPSIS trademark, in a domain name or otherwise.

The disputed domain name was registered using a proxy service. The registrant details disclosed by the Registrar bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name whatsoever. Indeed, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name appears to have been registered making use of the name of a former employee of the Complainant.

It is clear from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant as part of a fraudulent employment phishing scheme, targeting prospective employees of the Complainant, that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its SYNOPSIS trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name comprises a misspelling of the Complainant's SYNOPSIS trademark, altered only by the replacement of the second occurrence of the letter "y" by the letter "v", creating confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark (i.e., typosquatting) is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. Examples of such typos include the substitution of similar-appearing characters; see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as using it to send fraudulent emails as part of a phishing employment scheme, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as it was used to send fraudulent emails as part of a phishing employment scheme, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <synopsvs.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/R. Eric Gaum/

R. Eric Gaum

Sole Panelist

Date: January 31, 2025