

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

TATA Sons Private Limited, TATA Digital Private Limited v. Mavendra Singh
Case No. D2025-2154

1. The Parties

The Complainants are TATA Sons Private Limited, India, and TATA Digital Private Limited, India, internally represented.

The Respondent is Mavendra Singh, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar[s]

The disputed domain names <tataneutechnologies.com>, <tataneuindustries.com>, and <tataneumotors.com>, are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 2, 2025. On June 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 4, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 6, 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 June 9, 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 June 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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 Complainants are members of TATA Group of Companies, which provides various services and consumer products including provision of consultancy services, manufacturing and selling of steel products, chemical products, watches, hospitality services etc. There are 26 publicly listed TATA enterprises having a total market value of USD 365 billion as on March 31, 2024.

TATA Sons Private Limited (the “Complainant No.1”) is a holding company and promoter of Tata enterprises, incorporated in the year November 1917. TATA Digital Private Limited (the “Complainant No.2”) was incorporated in the year March 2019 and it launched its mobile application under the trademark/brand name Tata NEU in the year 2021. The Complainant No.1 holds the right to the trademark TATA and several other TATA formative marks. It is pertinent to note that Complainant No.2 is authorised to use the mark TATA and carry business in India. Some of the trademarks held by Complainant No.1 in India are tabulated below:

Trademark	Trademark Number	Class(es)	Date of registration
	6089	9	August 15, 1946
TATA	1236890	35	June 2, 2006
TATA NEU	5149411	9,16,25,35,36,38,39,41,42,44 and 45	April 4, 2022

The Complainant No.1 owns the domain name <tata.com> that has been registered since October 15, 1996, and <tataneu.com>, which has been registered since August 17, 2021.

Based on the evidence placed before the Panel, TATA has been recognised as a well-known trademark of the Complainants by Indian courts and prior panels.

The Respondent is Mavendra Singh allegedly from India who is the registrant of the disputed domain names <tataneuindustries.com>, <tataneumotors.com>, and <tataneutechnologies.com>, registered on April 9, 2025. All the three disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying pay-per-click links (“PPC”), which are related to the Complainants’ industries.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain names completely subsume the Complainant No.1’s well-known trademark TATA and TATA NEU and thereby are identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks over which the Complainants have rights. Further, that the Respondent has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services through the disputed domain names and it is evident that adoption of well-known mark of the Complainants is to show false affiliation with the TATA group of companies. The Complainants claim that such false affiliation is done with the intention to extract commercial advantage from the goodwill earned by the Complainants in the market evidencing the bad faith in registration and use of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the contentions of the Complainants.

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 Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark TATA and TATA NEU for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the trademarks of the Complainants are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that addition of the dictionary terms "industries", "motors", and "technologies" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the respective disputed domain names and the trademarks for the purposes of the Policy.

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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 Complainants' TATA and TATA NEU trademarks have immense goodwill and reputation and were well-known prior to the registration of the disputed domain names. Hence, the Respondent knew or should have knowledge of Complainants' trademarks.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying PPC links thereby making commercial and unfair use of the well-known marks of the Complainants. The Panel concurs with the Complainants' claim that the disputed domain names have been registered and used to mislead the Internet traffic and general public, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 names <tataneuindustries.com>, <tataneumotors.com>, and <tataneutechnologies.com> be transferred to the Complainant No. 2.

/Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar/
Saisunder Nedungal Vidhya Bhaskar
Sole Panelist
Date: July 29, 2025