

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Rangwan Dusdeesurapot
Case No. D2025-1012

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Rangwan Dusdeesurapot, Thailand.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syngenta-events.com> ("the Disputed Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 12, 2025. On March 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 12, 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 (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 March 13, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 13, 2025.

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 March 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on April 8, 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 is a well-known Swiss science company with 30,000 employees in 90 countries.

The SYNGENTA trademark has been registered in several jurisdictions at a national and international level: see, as mere example, the International registration No. 732663 SYNGENTA, granted on March 8, 2000 and duly renewed, covering classes 01, 02, 05, 07, 08, 09, 10, 16, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 41, and 42, designating inter alia Kenya, United Kingdom, Iceland, Germany, Russian Federation and Viet Nam).

The Complainant also owns, among others, the domain name <syngenta.com>, registered since 1999 and connected to the Complainant's official website. The Complainant further has its own "Events" section on its official Swiss website at <syngenta.ch>.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 4, 2025, and seems to be currently inactive, even though it previously resolved to a login webpage using the Complainant's word trademark and logo.

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.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations in different jurisdictions worldwide that consist of the SYNGENTA mark. The Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates such trademark with the mere addition of the English word "events" and is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant confirms it has never licensed, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the SYNGENTA trademark in any manner.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, since the attempt of letting Internet users believe there is a connection between the Complainant's business activity and the Respondent's website cannot be considered conduct in good faith, especially considering the Respondent is using the Complainant's distinctive signs (word trademark and logo) without authorization.

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 established rights to the SYNGENTA trademark, as demonstrated by its registrations and widespread continued use. The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark because it contains the entirety of the Complainant's mark with the addition of the generic term "events", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's registered trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the 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.

The Complainant has shown that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain. Rather, the Respondent was trying to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing - on the website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolved - the Complainant's official trademarks. The Panel notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety along with the addition of the term "events", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1) and that no disclaimer or notice on the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Complainant and the Respondent was displayed on the website. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illicit activities (such as impersonation/passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest 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.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered long after the Complainant first started using and registered its well-known SYNGENTA trademark. Given the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's mark and that the Complainant also has an "Events" section under its own website, it is

clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SYNGENTA mark at the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and registered it in order to take unfair advantage of it.

Indeed, by reproducing the Complainant's registered trademark in the Disputed Domain Name and within the corresponding website, the Respondent was suggesting to Internet users that the Disputed Domain Name is somehow connected with the Complainant, which is not true.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out, without limitation, circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. The circumstance set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy is if a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. Based on the evidence presented, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Furthermore, UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Noting the circumstances of the case, the current non-use of the Disputed Domain Name does not change the Panel's finding on bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3).

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 <syngenta-events.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: April 25, 2025