

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. twanam withrow68
Case No. D2025-2208

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is twanam withrow68, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentaapp.xyz>, <syngentainvest.click>, <syngentainvest.top>, <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol>, and <syngentaweb.xyz> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 5, 2025. On June 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 8, 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 10, 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 11, 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 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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 global science-based agrochemical technology company specializing in agrochemicals for crop protection, vegetables and flower seeds, with 30,000 employees in 90 countries.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademark registrations:

Trademark	Registration No.	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration	Class
SYNGENTA	3036058	United States of America	December 27, 2005.	Class 1, Class 2, Class 5, Class 7, Class 8, Class 9, Class 10, Class 16, Class 29, Class 30, Class 31, Class 32, Class 35, Class 36, Class 41, and Class 42.
SYNGENTA	732663	International trademark	March 8, 2000.	Class 1, Class 2, Class 5, Class 7, Class 8, Class 9, Class 10, Class 16, Class 29, Class 30, Class 31, Class 32, Class 35, Class 36, Class 41, and Class 42.
SYNGENTA	1999/21793	South Africa	November 24, 2009.	Class 5.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names, such as <syngenta.com>, <syngenta.co.za>, <syngenta.com.au>, <syngenta.fr>, <syngenta-us.com>, <syngenta.cn>, <syngenta.co.uk>, <syngenta.co.in>, <syngenta.de>, <syngenta.ru>, and <syngenta.vn> among others.

The disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentaapp.xyz>, <syngentainvest.click>, <syngentainvest.top>, <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol>, and <syngentaweb.xyz> were registered on May 14, 2025.

The disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentainvest.click>, and <syngentainvest.top> resolve to a similar login website using the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark and logo with agricultural imagery. The disputed domain name <syngentaweb.xyz> resolves to a website featuring an image of the Complainant's products. The disputed domain names <syngentaapp.xyz>, <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, and <syngentaweb.lol> do not resolve to an active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That the disputed domain names entirely comprise the Complainant's global and well-known trademark SYNGENTA, with the addition of common terms such as "app", "invest", and "web".

That the disputed domain names generate a risk of confusion among the public, who might think that they are owned and operated by the Complainant.

That, according to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), the incorporation of additional terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between a trademark and the disputed domain names under the first element.

That previous panels have found confusing similarity between a trademark and a disputed domain name despite the addition of terms such as "app", "invest", and "web" (citing *Carrefour SA v. abudllah salimi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2670](#); *Syngenta Participations AG v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Nikolay Kovalev*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1337](#); and *AXA SA v. Duffet Orlene*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1102](#)).

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant, nor is it authorized to use the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademarks.

III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentainvest.click>, and <syngentainvest.top> resolve to websites containing the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademark, logo and agricultural imagery to mislead the public into believing that said websites (as well as the consent formed required to be filled-in therein as part of a log-in process) were created or authorized by the Complainant. That this impersonation conduct increases the risk of individuals disclosing information under the false impression that they were interacting with the Complainant (and cites *Farfetch UK Limited v. 雪林*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2628](#)).

That previous panels have found bad faith when an impersonation page has been used to collect login credentials (citing *Principal Financial Services, Inc. v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Freedom Finance, My Freedom Finance*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0489](#)).

That the disputed domain name <syngentaweb.xyz> resolves to a website featuring an image of the Complainant's products (which can be found on the Complainant's website to which the domain name <syngenta.co.in> resolves). That the unauthorized reproduction of said image not only infringes the Complainant's copyrights, trademarks and intellectual property rights in general, but also creates a false association between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

That the disputed domain names <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol> and <syngentaweb.xyz> do not resolve to an active website, but that the Respondent is perhaps holding them in reserve. That, in any event, passive holding does not preclude a bad faith finding (and cites *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#)).

That none of the disputed domain names are being used in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial fair use.

That the Respondent used nonsensical contact information for registration purposes, because it declared that it was domiciled in Hong Kong, China, while giving a phone number with Andorra's country code, and a Chinese postal code. That the use of fake information for registration purposes is another indication of bad faith.

That some of the disputed domain names resolve to websites which impersonate the Complainant and harvest phone numbers from the public, while other disputed domain names are being passively held.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the Complainant must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in connection to the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#); and *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. null John Zuccarini, Country Walk*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0487](#); see also [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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the SYNGENTA trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademarks because they reproduce said trademarks entirely (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7). The incorporation of terms such as "app", "web", and "invest" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's SYNGENTA trademarks are recognizable in the disputed domain names (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8; see also *Playboy Enterprises International, Inc. v. Zeynel Demirtas*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0768](#); *InfoSpace.com, Inc. v. Hari Prakash*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0076](#); *AT&T Corp. v. WorldclassMedia.com*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0553](#); and *Six*

Continents Hotels, Inc., Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation v. South East Asia Tours, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0388](#)).

The addition of the Top-Level Domains “.pro”, “.top”, “.xyz”, “.click”, “.cfd”, and “.lol” to the disputed domain names constitutes a technical requirement of the Domain Name System (“DNS”). Thus, it has no legal significance in assessing identity or confusing similarity in the present case (see *CARACOLITO S SAS v. Nelson Brown, OXM.CO*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0268](#); *SAP SE v. Mohammed Aziz Sheikh, Sapteq Global Consulting Services*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0565](#); and *Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1919](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

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 to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has asserted that there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and that the Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its SYNGENTA trademarks, or to register the disputed domain names (see *Amdocs Development Ltd. and Amdocs Software Systems Ltd. v. cenk erdogan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3044](#); *Amdocs Development Ltd. and Amdocs Software Systems Ltd. v. Nick Lamba*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2573](#); and *Autodesk, Inc. v. Brian Byrne, meshIP, LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0191](#)).

The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the Respondent has caused the disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentainvest.click>, and <syngentainvest.top> to resolve to websites displaying the Complainant’s SYNGENTA trademark, logo, and agricultural imagery, and that said websites comprise a fraudulent consent form soliciting information from Internet users who think they are submitting said information to the Complainant.

The Complainant has also filed evidence showing that the disputed domain name <syngentaweb.xyz> resolves to a website that makes available an unauthorized reproduction of an image of the Complainant’s products, which copyrights seem to belong to the Complainant.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The case file contains no evidence that demonstrates that the Respondent has used or has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services (see *Valentino S.p.A. v. Qiu Yufeng, Li Lianye*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1747](#); and *Associated Newspapers Limited v. Manjeet Singh*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2914](#)).

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, its trademarks, and its business. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

The Complainant has ascertained its rights over its SYNGENTA trademarks. The Panel notes that the dates of registration of the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademarks significantly precede the date of registration of the disputed domain names. Previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can in itself create a presumption of bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4). This is so in the present case because the Complainant's SYNGENTA trademarks are well-known and have been extensively used worldwide (see *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Vuong Tuong Trieu, Vuong Tuong Trieu*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1358](#); and *Syngenta Crop Protection AG v. Raymond Frangi, RMF CONSTRUCTIONS PTY*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2015](#)).

According to the evidence comprised in the case file, the Respondent more likely than not provided false contact information when registering the disputed domain names (listing a Hong Kong, China, address, a phone number with an Andorran country code and a Chinese postal code shows the Respondent's disregard for disclosing accurate contact information). Previous panels appointed under the Policy have held that circumstances such as this one serve as an indication of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names on May 14, 2025, well after the Complainant obtained its first registrations for its SYNGENTA trademarks and began using said trademarks. The Respondent's bad faith registration is evidenced by the fact that: (1) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known SYNGENTA trademarks, as they incorporate said trademarks entirely; (2) the Respondent used the disputed domain names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentainvest.click>, and <syngentainvest.top> to mislead Internet users into disclosing their information as part of a fraudulent log-in process; and (3) the disputed domain name <syngentaweb.xyz> resolved to a website that makes available an unauthorized reproduction of an image of the Complainant's products, which copyrights seem to belong to the Complainant.

The case docket shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant and its potential clients, which constitutes opportunistic bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1; see also *L'Oréal v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0149511181 / Jerry Peter*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1937](#); and *Gilead Sciences Ireland UC / Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Domain Maybe For Sale c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0980](#)).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (in the present case claimed as impersonation/passing off, and fraudulent conduct aimed at unlawfully obtaining information from users who think that they are dealing with the Complainant) constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, *Arla Foods Amba v. Michael Guthrie, M. Guthrie Building Solutions*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2213](#); and *Minerva S.A. v. Whoisguard Protected, Whoisguard, Inc., / GREYHAT SERVICES*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0385](#)). The use of a domain name for illegal purposes, such as fraud or phishing activities, constitutes bad faith under the Policy (see *Banque Palatine v. Alex McQueen, HN LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3190](#)).

Additionally, the disputed domain names <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol>, and <syngentaweb.xyz> do not resolve to an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the current non-use of the disputed domain names <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol>, and <syngentaweb.xyz> does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. While panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of the registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the well-known nature and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that under the circumstances of this case passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of 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 names <syngentaapp.pro>, <syngentaapp.top>, <syngentaapp.xyz>, <syngentainvest.click>, <syngentainvest.top>, <syngentainvest.xyz>, <syngentaweb.cfd>, <syngentaweb.lol>, and <syngentaweb.xyz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kiyoshi Tsuru/

Kiyoshi Tsuru

Sole Panelist

Date: August 1, 2025