

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cisco Technology, Inc. v. Fateh Singh, Techboy Solutions
Case No. D2025-1688

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cisco Technology, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fenwick & West, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Fateh Singh, Techboy Solutions, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <routercisco.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 April 25, 2025. On April 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 29, 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 (Customers of Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 May 1, 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 May 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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 company incorporated in the United States that operates as the intellectual property holding company of Cisco Systems, Inc., a NASDAQ listed networking and communications equipment and software company with more than 75,000 employees in countries throughout the world. The Complainant cites its registrations for the trademark CISCO and variations of it in numerous countries, including, for example, United States Trademark Registration Number 1542339, registered on June 6, 1989, for the mark CISCO.

The Complainant owns the domain name <cisco.com>, which was registered on May 14, 1987, and hosts its main website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 16, 2024, and resolves to a webpage that prominently displays the Complainant's trademark, and provides the information in relation to Cisco router login process. The website displays a copyright notice "Copyright © 2025 | Cisco Router", and also displays a disclaimer at the bottom of website: "This website belongs to a third-party firm, owned and operated independently. Any use of products, trademarks, services and brands are just for general guidance. This website has no association or certification with any of the companies unless specified."

5. Parties' Contentions

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 cites trademark registrations for the mark CISCO, and variations of it, in numerous jurisdictions as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that the mark CISCO is well-known and that its rights predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, and submits that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its trademark, for the reason that the addition of the term "router" to the Disputed Domain Name does "not prevent a finding of confusing similarity."

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because the "Respondent has not been commonly known by the [Disputed] Domain Name at the time of registration, and (2) Respondent is not using the [Disputed] Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the [Disputed] Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain" and contends that none of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy apply.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules having regard to the prior use and submits that "Respondent's conduct of registering a domain name, wholly incorporating Cisco's CISCO mark, to attract Internet users to its website where its advertising technical support services and a chatbot", is indicative of bad faith. It also submits that the use by the Respondent of "a disclaimer in tiny typeface at the bottom of [its] webpage, disclaiming 'association or certification with any of the companies unless specified.' ...after a full page of material emulating Cisco's corporate website"... "is not effective for purposes of either paragraph 4(a)(i) or 4(a)(iii) of the Policy."

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

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

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.

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 Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark CISCO in numerous countries.

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the CISCO trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name is comprised of: (a) the word "router"; (b) followed by the Complainant's trademark CISCO; (c) followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") .com.

It is well established that the gTLD used as part of a domain name is generally disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: "routercisco".

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.

Although the addition of the word "router" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letters 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 Disputed 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 Disputed 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 Panel finds that there is no indication that the Respondent was commonly known by the term “routercisco” prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has not licensed, permitted, or authorized the Respondent to use the trademark CISCO. The Panel also notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

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.

The Panel notes the evidence that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a webpage that imitates the Complainant’s webpage, artwork and displays its products and trademarks, and finds that this does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given the substantial reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s mark or capacity to otherwise mislead Internet users. As discussed in Section 6C of the Decision, the disclaimer on the Respondent cannot avoid Internet user’s confusion.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation and passing off, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the evidence in the case shows the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

On the issue of registration, this Panel finds that there is no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name other than to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s well-known trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, a gap of several years between registration of a complainant’s trademark and respondent’s registration of a disputed domain name (containing the trademark) may indicate bad faith registration. In this case, the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name some 36 years after the Complainant established registered trademark rights in the CISCO mark. The Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant’s allegations or to offer an alternative explanation.

On the issue of use, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website that displayed the Complainants trademarks, artwork and products and provided technical support services and a chatbot which could induce users to disclose sensitive information.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent has plainly targeted the Complainant and that its registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the use of a tiny disclaimer on the Respondent's website does nothing to dispel the Respondent's bad faith for the reason that the Respondent is simply unable to make good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name on a website that imitates the Complainant's. The Respondent's disclaimer is neither clear nor sufficiently prominent to support a finding that the Respondent has undertaken reasonable steps to avoid unfairly passing itself off as related to the Complainant, or to otherwise confuse users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7.

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 <routercisco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2025