

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. NAME REDACTED, Syngenta
Case No. D2025-0256

1. The Parties

- 1.1 The Complainant is Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Switzerland, represented internally.
- 1.2 The Respondent is NAME REDACTED, Syngenta.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

- 2.1 The disputed domain name <syngentasg.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

- 3.1 The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 23, 2025. At that time, publicly available Whois details identified the “Registration Organisation” for the Domain Name as “Syngenta” but was otherwise expressed to be “REDACTED FOR PRIVACY”.
- 3.2 On January 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing the underlying registrant and contact information for the Domain Name.

¹On January 28, 2025 the Complainant requested that references to the “Respondent Name” disclosed by the Registrar in this decision be redacted, since it was the name of a real employee of the Respondent, who did not in fact register the Domain Name. In *Banco Bradesco S.A v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net* / Name Redacted, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#), the panel redacted from the formal name of the decision the name of an innocent third party individual who had had their domain name account hijacked, and did not otherwise identify the name that person in its decision. The Panel accepts the Complainant’s contention that this employee was not responsible for the registration of the Domain Name and is therefore happy to redact that person’s name from the formal name and paragraph 1.2 of this decision, and directs accordingly. As this employee is not identified by name in any other part of the decision, there is no need to make any further amendment or redaction to the decision, in this respect.

3.3 The Center sent an email to the Complainant on January 24, 2025, 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 January 28, 2025.

3.4 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”).

3.5 In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 3, 2025.

3.6 The Center appointed Matthew S. Harris as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 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

4.1 The Complainant is a global, agtech company incorporated in Switzerland. Its products include agrochemicals for crop protection as well as vegetable and flower seeds. It has 30,000 employees in 90 countries. Sales in the group of companies to which it belongs were over USD32 billion in 2023.

4.2 The Complainant is the owner of various registered trade marks around the world that comprise or incorporate the term “Syngenta”. They include:

(i) International trade mark registration no. 732663 for SYNGENTA in classes 01, 02, 05, 07, 08, 09, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, with a registration date of March 8, 2000 which has proceeded to registration in respect of at least some of these classes in one form or another in at least sixty territories; and

(ii) Singapore trade mark registration no T99/13791A for SYNGENTA as a “Conventional Mark” in class 05 with an application date of November 30, 1999 and a registration date of August 14, 2001.

4.3 The Complainant is also the owner of various domain names that incorporate the term “Syngenta”, including <syngenta.com>. It also operates a website from the domain name <syngentaturf.sg>, which it uses to promote its turf business in Singapore.

4.4 The Domain Name was registered on December 23, 2024. It has been used since registration to resolve to a website holding page that claims that the website is “under construction”. The underlying registration details provided by the Registrar included the name of an employee of the Complainant in Singapore, but that employee did not register the Domain Name.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

5.1 The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

5.2 In addition to setting out its business, marks and the use made of the Domain Name, it contends that there is evidence of MX records connected to the Domain Name and claims that any email sent from an email address incorporating the domain name could “expose the recipient to potential malicious activity such as phishing”.

5.3 The Complainant also contends that it “attempted to send notifications of our intellectual property rights through the registrar contact form three times, but each attempt failed to be sent.”

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

6.1 It is generally 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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

6.2 The Complainant has shown rights for the purposes of the Policy in various registered trade marks, that comprise the term “SYNGENTA”. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

6.3 The entirety of term “SYNGENTA” and consequentially the entirety of the Complainant’s SYNGENTA trade marks are reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Panel finds these marks are recognisable within the Domain Name and that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

6.4 Although the addition of other terms (in this case, the letters “sg”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

6.5 Accordingly, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests and Registered and Used in Bad Faith

6.6 It is usual for panels under the Policy to consider the issues of rights or legitimate interests and registration and use in bad faith in turn. However, in this case it is more convenient to consider those issues together. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.15.

6.7 The Panel is persuaded that the Domain Name inherently and falsely represents that it is controlled by the Complainant. The letters “syngenta” in the Domain Name are most likely to be understood as referring to the Complainant’s marks and business, and the letters “sg” are most likely to be understood as an abbreviation of and as a reference to Singapore. It follows that the Domain Name is most likely to be understood by Internet users as one that is being or will be used for a website or other online presence or activity operated by the Complainant in respect of its (or associated companies’) activities in Singapore.

6.8 The Panel also accepts that it was the deliberate intention of the Respondent that the Domain Name be understood that way and has been registered and held to impersonate the Complainant. First there is the use of the term “Syngenta”, which as far as the Panel is aware has no meaning other than by reference to the Complainant’s name and marks. Second, and in any event, the Respondent’s actual intentions are clear

from the underlying Whois registration details provided by the Registrar in the course of these proceedings. These show that the Respondent purported to register the Domain Name on behalf of “Syngenta” and using the name of a real employee of the Complainant’s business in Singapore, even though that person did not in fact register the Domain Name.

6.9 Why the Respondent is doing this is unclear. The Complainant is clearly concerned that this may be for the purpose of sending emails impersonating the Complainant’s. However, regardless of the exact reason, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent is seeking to profit in some fashion from its impersonation of the Complainant.

6.10 There are no rights or legitimate interests in holding a domain name for the purpose of falsely impersonating a trade mark owner (see section 2.5.1 the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)), and the fact that a domain name is or has been used for such a purpose is evidence that no such rights or legitimate interests exist. Further, the registration and use of a domain name for such a purpose involves registration and use in bad faith (see also in this respect to the comments in sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) regarding domain names that take the form of a mark and a geographical term, and the comments in section 3.6 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) as to the use of false contact details).

6.11 In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the second and third elements of the Policy have been established.

7. Decision

7.1 For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Domain Name <syngentasg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew S. Harris/

Matthew S. Harris

Sole Panelist

Date: March 19, 2025