

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Isuzu Motors Limited v. Hino Global
Case No. D2025-0699

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Isuzu Motors Limited, Japan, represented by BrandShelter, France.

The Respondent is Hino Global, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <isuzu-sg.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 February 20, 2025. On February 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 21, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Registrar’s verification also included information regarding a second disputed domain name, which was included in the initial Complaint filing and had been repossessed by the Registrar. On March 6, 2025, the Complainant confirmed that they were pursuing settlement of the repossessed disputed domain name. On March 12, 2025, the Center suspended the proceedings for the settlement of the repossessed disputed domain name. On April 24, 2024, the Center notified the parties that the repossessed disputed domain name had been settled. On May 28, 2025, the Complainant confirmed that the settlement agreement had been implemented and requested the reinstatement of the proceedings. On May 28, 2025, the Center notified the Parties and Registrar of the dismissal of the settled disputed domain name from the proceedings. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 June 6, 2025.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on July 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Alan L. Limbury as the sole panelist in this matter on July 4, 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

Established in 1937, the Complainant, Isuzu Motors Limited, commonly known as Isuzu, is a Japanese multinational automobile manufacturer headquartered in Yokohama. Its principal activity is the production, marketing and sale of commercial vehicles and diesel engines.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations for the figurative trademark ISUZU, including International Reg. No. 1293778, registered on August 26, 2015 in Classes 4, 7, 9, 12, 16, 35, 36, 37 and 39, and International Reg. No. 1742539, registered on September 27, 2022 in Classes 4, 7, 9, 12, 16, 28, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41 and 42, in both cases designating inter alia India, where the Respondent is located, and Singapore. The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <isuzu.co.jp> which presents the Complainant and its activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 11, 2024. On November 14, 2024, an email was sent from "Isuzu Motors <hrteam@isuzu-sg.com>" to a candidate for employment with "ISUZU MOTORS ASIA LIMITED" in Singapore, seeking inter alia scanned copies of the recipient's passport. The email displayed a copy of the Complainant's figurative International Trademark Reg. No. 1742539 and the statement: "This email was sent from an email account of Isuzu Motors."

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 that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, which was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name has been used in an unauthorized manner for phishing activities. The Respondent could by no means have ignored the Complainant's prior trademarks rights.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here a hyphen and the abbreviation for Singapore "sg", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 illegitimate activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, 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

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 illegitimate activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, 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 <isuzu-sg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alan L. Limbury/

Alan L. Limbury

Sole Panelist

Date: July 11, 2025