

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Network18 Media & Investments Limited v. Anshuman Randhawa
Case No. D2025-2235

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Network18 Media & Investments Limited, India, represented by Ira Law Firm, India.

The Respondent is Anshuman Randhawa, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <moneycontrolpro.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 9, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 11, 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 ("Domain Admin") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 12, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 an Indian media conglomerate engaged in financial news sector under its mark MONEYCONTROL. The Complainant's mark MONEYCONTROL is registered in India since the year 2012 and details of some of such registrations are as below:

- MONEYCONTROL – Indian Registration No. 2274496, registered on January 31, 2012, in class 36.
- MONEYCONTROL PLUS – Indian Registration No. 3994541, registered on November 9, 2018, in class 9.
- MONEYCONTROL.COM – Indian Registration No. 1659728, registered on February 29, 2008, in class 9.
- MONEYCONTROL – Indian Registration No. 2274500, registered on January 31, 2012, in class 45.
-  – Indian Registration No. 3469735, registered on January 31, 2017, in class 41.

The Complainant's main business website is "www.moneycontrol.com" and has been registered since the year 1999. The Complainant also offers ad-free subscription services, under the terms MONEYCONTROL PRO and MONEYCONTROL SUPER PRO, offering access to additional content related to financial affairs.

The disputed domain name <moneycontrolpro.com> was registered on October 29, 2024. Pursuant to a takedown request filed by the Complainant in May 2025 with the Registrar and the Internet service provider, the content hosted on the disputed domain name was taken down. Presently, the disputed domain name does not resolve to any active website, but it is worth noting that in the past, the Respondent's website displayed the Complainant's marks MONEYCONTROL, and the MONEYCONTROL stylized device mark, and offered similar services, such as stock recommendations.

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 confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant. The Complainant states the disputed domain name incorporates the suffix "pro", which is also used by the Complainant to offer its premium subscription service under the brand MONEYCONTROL PRO.

The Complainant argues that it has used the trademark MONEYCONTROL in connection with financial services since at least as early as 1999. The Complainant contends that its trademark MONEYCONTROL enjoys substantial goodwill and reputation. The Complainant argues that its trademark registrations and prominent usage of its mark along with the Respondent's engagement in the same business of financial affairs, provide the Respondent with constructive knowledge of the Complainant's ownership of its mark MONEYCONTROL. Further, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Complainant otherwise authorised the Respondent to register the disputed domain name or otherwise use the Complainant's mark MONEYCONTROL. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering of goods/services. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was providing stock recommendations, in an attempt to defraud the customers under the pretext that these recommendations are being provided by the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent's website has already caused actual confusion. The Complainant received an enquiry from the Surveillance and Investigation Department of the Bombay Stock Exchange seeking confirmation as to whether the disputed domain name was associated with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that such confusion on the part of a reputed regulatory body is indicative of the deceptive nature of the Respondent's conduct. The Complainant further argues that this constitutes strong evidence of bad faith registration and use for which no rights or legitimate interests may exist.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent's bad faith is evident from website content of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's website gives a clear impression of being associated with the Complainant, including by using the Complainant's MONEYCONTROL stylized device mark, as shown below, and offering identical services.



B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is undisputed that the Complainant satisfies the first element which involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1. The entirety of the MONEYCONTROL mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the addition of the term "pro" as a suffix 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. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 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 with 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 such as, impersonation of the complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel is aware that presently the disputed domain name does not have any hosted content. However, the Panel finds that the Respondent's website in the past, was clearly aimed at providing stock recommendations, giving out loan offers and providing financial information with an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that these recommendations came from the Complainant. The Respondent appears to have been aware of the Complainant's MONEYCONTROL PRO paid subscription-based service and hence registered the disputed domain name.

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 Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent's conduct of using the Complainant's MONEYCONTROL stylized device mark on its website to impersonate the Complainant in an attempt to mislead Internet users amounts to registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. Particularly, the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the Respondent's website has resulted in actual confusion through impersonation; where an enquiry from the Surveillance and Investigation Department of the Bombay Stock Exchange seeking confirmation as to whether the disputed domain name was associated with the Complainant had been raised.

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 such as impersonation of the complainant 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 constitute 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 <moneycontrolpro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: July 22, 2025